DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 506 CE 000 643

AUTHOR	Fraizer, Robert Lee; And Others
TITLE	Incarceration and Adult Felon Probation in Texas: A Cost Comparison. Criminal Justice Monograph. Volume IV, Number 3.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.
SPONS AGENCY	Criminal Justice Council of Texas.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	128p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Graphic Arts Dept., Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77340 ($12.70)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Rehabilitation; *Corrective Institutions; *Cost Effectiveness; Criminals; Operations Research; Parole Officers; Prisoners; Probation Officers; *Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; State Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

In attempting to determine the cost of probation and the cost of incarceration of adult felons in Texas, it was discovered that there were no comparative figures available. A search of the literature was conducted to determine the proper standards for probation caseload management and to identify problems associated with previous cost studies. In a comparison of physical and economic factors in Texas counties that have probation and those that do not, five relevant factors were determined: population, wages, taxable property, manufacturing value, and total income. The higher the statistics for any of the five factors, the more likely the county was to have probation. Different methods were used to determine the cost to the taxpayer for the operation of the prison system (direct costs) and the costs to the State associated with loss of the breadwinner (indirect costs). Using the California system as a model with some modification, the Texas model determined that, with the State assisting the counties initially, the cost per man per day for probation was 5.22 less than for incarceration. Recommendations for establishing a probation system for adult felons were based on that determination. (Pertinent statistical tables are included in the appendixes.) (AG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085506

CE

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ICCBS by
Charles M. Friel
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Vol. IV, No. 3
1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Incarceration and Adult Felon Probation In Texas: A Cost Comparison

Robert Lee Fraizer
Charles M. Friel
Donald J. Weisenhorn
John A. Cocoros

CE 000 643

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Huntsville, Texas 77340

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS 77340

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

GEORGE G. KILLINGER, Ph.D., *Chairman*

CHARLES M. FRIEL, Ph.D.
DOROTHY D. HAYES, Ph.D.
HAZEL B. KERPER, J.D.
JAMES D. MCLEOD, M.A.
DONALD J. WEISENHORN, M.S.W.
JEANNE P. YOUNG, M.S.W.

ADMINISTRATION OF MONOGRAPH

GEORGE G. KILLINGER,
Director of Institute

CHARLES M. FRIEL, *Director*
Monograph Series

This MONOGRAPH was prepared for use in the Center for Continuing Education in Criminal Justice under grant from the Criminal Justice Council of Texas.

Copyright © 1973
By
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and The Behavioral Sciences
Sam Houston State University

The CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH is designed to provide interested citizens and professionals in the criminal justice field with a series of articles on the problems of crime and delinquency. The series includes both experimental studies and theoretical papers on problems in law enforcement, corrections, probation and parole, criminology, criminal law, forensic psychology and social welfare. The MONOGRAPH is not restricted to any particular philosophic approach to the prevention and control of crime and delinquency, but encourages an eclectic discussion of all problems pertinent to the criminal justice system.

Permission to quote excerpts is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given the author and the MONOGRAPH. Requests for permission to reprint an entire article should be addressed to the Director of the Institute.

(Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter, August 24, 1912, at the Post Office at Huntsville.)

ED 085506

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Vol. IV, No. 3
1973

Incarceration and Adult Felon Probation In Texas: A Cost Comparison

Robert Lee Fraizer
Charles M. Friel
Donald J. Weisenhorn
John A. Cocoros

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Huntsville, Texas 77340

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose 1
Methods and Procedures 2
Definition of Terms 3

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 5

Historical Perspectives 5
Current Literature on Cost 9

III. ANALYSIS OF DATA 11

Physical and Economic Factors in Counties . . 19
Internal Cost of Operating the Texas Department of Corrections 22
Discussion of Cost 22
Mineral Lease Fund 26
Industrial Revolving Fund 27
Education and Recreation Fund 27
General Revenue Fund 28
Net Cost of the Texas Department of Corrections Operations 28
Cost of Incarceration External to the Texas Department of Corrections 28
Expenditures by Supporting State and Federal Agencies 28
Indirect Cost of Incarceration 31
Summary of External Cost of Incarceration . 37
Total Cost of Incarceration in 1970 38
The Cost of Probation for Adult Felons 38
Definition of Cost 38
Probation Cost Model 40
Summary of Probation Cost 47

IV. A COMPARISON OF THE COST OF INCARCERATION AND THE COST OF PROBATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE SUPPORT 50

Cost Comparison 50
Difference in Cost 50
Cost Elements not Included 51
Comparison of Cost of a Present Probation Office with the Model 53
The Need for State Support 54
A Proposal for Sharing Savings 55
Probation Coordination Board 55
Probation Coordination Office 55
Orientation Program 56
State Operated Training Facility 57
Recommended Procedure 57

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 60

Recommendations 61

BIBLIOGRAPHY 62

APPENDIX 65

A. Economic Loss/Gain Due to Incarceration . . 65
B. Responses by Inmates in the Sample 67
C. Staffing Pattern for Probation Offices . . . 85
D. Probation Cost Model 89
E. Probation Cost Model Excluding Facility and Equipment Cost 106

VITA 123

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Significance of Physical and Economic Factors as Probation Office Predictors	21
II.	General Revenue Fund Expenditures/Income	29
III.	Cost to the Taxpayer of Internal Operations of the Texas Department of Corrections	30
IV.	Cost of Incarceration in 1970 Based on Agencies in Direct Support of the Texas Department of Corrections	33
V.	Aid to Families with Dependent Children	33
VI.	Factors used to Compute Indirect Cost	35
VII.	Total Indirect Cost of Incarceration	36
VIII.	Summary of the External Cost of Incarceration	38
IX.	Total Cost of Incarceration in 1970	39
X.	Summary of Probation Cost Elements	41
XI.	Cost of Model Probation System for Texas	48
XII.	Cost of Probation Excluding Facility and Equipment Cost	49
XIII.	Cost Model for a Population of 20,000	49
XIV.	Comparison of Probation and Incarceration Cost	52
XV.	Probation Coordination Office	56
XVI.	Recommended Budget for Probation Coordination Office	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This thesis deals with a determination of the cost of probation and the cost of incarceration of adult felons in Texas. The importance of the cost aspect of probation is evident when it is realized that the prison population in Texas is increasing at a high rate while reports from some other states indicate a decreasing prison population. For example, one state recently found that by lowering probation caseloads and improving probation service through a state subsidy plan, there was a corresponding decrease in the rate of prison commitment. It is generally conceded that the net result is a reduction in cost to the taxpayer. However, one of the problems has been that the accounting methods used to develop cost have traditionally been based on elements that make cost comparisons difficult if not impossible.

As of September 1971, ninety-seven Texas counties did not offer professional probation service for adult felons. And, the offices in those counties that did offer probation service for adult felons were characterized by excessive caseloads that amounted to little more than paperwork supervision similar to suspended sentence administration. It is

evident that calculation of the total cost of probation for the state, based only on these active probation offices, would be of little value for other than a state to state comparison of what is presently being expended on probation. To attempt to compare this cost with the cost of incarceration would also have limited value due to the lack of common elements in the cost calculations.

It is proposed in this study to look at the likelihood of further probation expansion based on the present county financed system of probation. It is also proposed to not only attempt to develop more realistic cost information on probation and incarceration for the purpose of comparison, but in so doing to outline the elements on which future cost studies could be based. It is intended that the cost information developed in this study can be utilized in Texas for probation planning. And, it is anticipated that the baselining of cost elements will be of some permanent value for future cost studies.

Methods and Procedures

A survey of the literature was conducted to find meaningful information for use in determining the proper standards for probation caseload management and to identify problems associated with previous cost studies. The information uncovered in the survey of the literature was discussed with persons in the criminal justice field who were familiar with similar studies and with experts in accounting methods from the university, government and business

communities. Based on these discussions, the proper elements of cost were determined.

The cost information on the Texas Department of Corrections was obtained by consultation with officials of the Department and other state agencies involved in support of the prison system. The indirect cost of incarceration associated with loss of the breadwinner was determined by using a sample of inmates. This average indirect cost was derived and illustrated by frequency distribution.

A facilities survey of selected representative probation offices was conducted to obtain current cost data on adult felon probation in Texas. Mathematical formulas were developed to relate this data to a model cost system so that a computer could be used to analyze the mass of data available.

Definition of Terms

The terms below are those for which operational definitions had to be made prior to collecting data. Other unfamiliar terms that are used in the text are explained in their order of occurrence.

Depreciation of fixed assets - the cost of a fixed asset spread over its life rather than being charged in a lump sum during the first year.

Cost - the difference between cash expenditures and cash income.

Internal cost of incarceration - expenditures and income (cash) reported against the General Revenue Fund by the

State Auditors Office for the Texas Department of Corrections.

External cost of incarceration - (a) the cost of services provided by other State and Federal agencies in direct support of the Texas Department of Corrections, and (b) the indirect cost of incarceration that is a result of loss of the breadwinner.

Cost per man per year - the average cost per man computed by dividing the total cost of operations by the average inmate population or caseload.

Cost per man per day - the average cost per man computed by dividing the average cost per man per year by the number of days in a year.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Perspectives

The system of imprisonment, as a means of deterent and prevention of crime, came about a little over two centuries ago. At that time, the general belief that criminals were possessed by demons was modified into a belief that crime was deliberately committed for the pleasure or profit of the criminal. It required almost one hundred fifty years for authorities to realize that many of the features of prison life had the opposite effect of that desired. Authorities now realize that the community itself must share some of the blame for crime and that the community can influence crime reduction through the offering of its services. John Augustus wrote the following entry in his diary over one hundred years ago:

> "During the first year, I saved one hundred twenty persons from the house of corrections. Twenty were subsequently sentenced to the house of corrections, but the remaining one hundred are in the community doing well. It would be easy to show the actual amount, in dollars and cents, saved to the state but other results are not as easy to exhibit, i.e., the blessing resulting to rescued men or to their families, many of whom would otherwise have become outcasts or found their way into our alms houses."

The change in belief over the years, starting with John Augustus, has led to the system of supervising offenders in the community that we refer to today as probation. Probation is instituted based on the belief that reintegration is a primary goal and that this goal can be achieved more readily in the community. However, like John Augustus, in his day, authorities have continued, somewhat blindly, to assume that probation could reach its potential based entirely on its success record. In study after study, it has been shown that probation is at least as successful as imprisonment as a means of success through supervision. In California, based on a study conducted over a period of seven years, seventy-two percent of a total of 11,638 probationers completed their terms. A summary report by the Task Force on Corrections showed that in fifteen different studies success rates ranged from sixty to ninety percent.[1] The danger of overselling probation was described by the Gluecks:

> "All that can be claimed and expected of any device for coping with criminality by way of treatment, is that it is of some assistance in an appreciable number of cases in putting certain offenders on the road toward rehabilitation---Effectiveness depends far more on wise and well trained personnel than on legislation, or systems, or buildings."[2]

---

[1]Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p.165

[2]Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor J. Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers, New York, 1930, p.7

One major question pertaining to the merits of probation is not whether we should have probation but is related to the quality and quantity of officers in the probation departments that now exist. The national corrections survey conducted in 1965 showed that 3.1 percent of all felon probation cases were handled by probation officers with less than fifty cases and that the remainder of adult felons on probation were handled by probation officers with caseloads over fifty. In fact, sixty-seven percent of all felon cases were handled by probation officers with a caseload of over one hundred. The Presidents Commission recommended that caseloads should not exceed thirty-five per officer.[1]

Based on the success of probation, in the face of seemingly impossible caseloads, some authorities have concluded that significantly greater success can be achieved by filling the ranks with more officers to reduce the size of caseloads. The San Francisco Project (which is described in detail later in this chapter) showed that without a classification and diagnostic system, small caseloads (up to 20) were related to more failures (technical) than were caseloads up to eighty-five.[2]

---

[1]U.S. Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, 1967

[2]National Institute of Mental Health, The San Francisco Project: A Study of Federal Probation and Parole, April, 1969

According to Frederick Ward, in development of probation on a local basis, it is unrealistic to expect that services can or will be provided by each county. Consolidation is possible for some of the counties where other means are not available. Several states extend services to rural counties without affecting the status of already existing county departments. Ward indicates that state subsidy plans have some possibilities.[1] In reports from California, a state subsidy plan, based on a performance principle, has been an overwhelming success in reducing prison commitments.[2]

In some cases, the attempted establishment of state operated probation systems may have had an effect on the establishment of county systems. Over twenty years ago, in Texas, the Legislative Budget Bureau surveyed the need for appropriation for activation of a state probation system, which had already been authorized, and recommended a budget based on the appraisal of services needed. This project was recently reactivated by proponents of a state operated system. An almost immediate reaction, which could have been attributed to concern about state control, was

---

[1]Frederick Ward, Extending Adult Probation Services to All Communities, Commitment and the Correctional Process, 1951 Yearbook of the National Probation and Parole Association, edited, Margorie Bell

[2]State of California, Human Relations Agency Department of Youth Authority, Report on State Aid for Probation Services, October, 1970

that nine more counties established probation service for adult felons. In any case, "the burden is not on probation to prove its worth, it has been established, rather it is for government to measure up to its responsibility to promote opportunity, protection and justice while respecting the dignity of man."[1]

Current Literature on Cost and Standards

Federal Studies.--The survey accomplished by the Task Force on Corrections indicated that in 1965 there were 221,597 inmates in institutions at a total cost of $500 million. The cost per man per year was $1,966. This comes to over $5.00 per day per man. In the community, there were 369,897 at a cost of $73 million. The average cost per man per year was $198.00. This comes to approximately $.54 per day per man.[2]

In 1969, the National Institute of Mental Health conducted a study concerning probation caseload management. One of the purposes of this project was to test the standards used to determine the optimum probation caseload. Four types of caseload were set up. The ideal caseload was designed for a maximum of forty probationers, contacted twice each month, with the expectation that officers would have two presentence

---

[1]Frederick Ward, Extending Adult Probation Services to All Communities, Commitment and the Correctional Process, 1951 Yearbook of the National Probation and Parole Association, edited, Margorie Bell

[2]The Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report on Corrections, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967

investigations per month average. This would total fifty work units with each probationer equal to one work unit and each investigation equal to five work units. The normal caseload was to be 80-85 probationers with three to four presentence investigations per month. This was based on the average caseload found prior to the start of the project. The intensive caseload was to have twenty cases with an average of one presentence investigation per month. The fourth type of caseload included cases that would not be contacted, but any of these probationers could see any officer if assistance was required.

The cases were assigned to the officers in a random manner. After two years, there was a success rate of seventy-eight percent when technical violations were not considered (a function of officers awareness of infractions in intensive supervision). It was found that offenders appeared to be performing equally well under all special supervision levels. Also, no significant difference was found in the monthly earnings of the probationers.[1]

A 1961 report in the Social Security Bulletin indicated the cost impact of incarceration on Social Security.

---

[1]National Institute of Mental Health, The San Francisco Project: A Study of Federal Probation and Parole, 1967

This report found that 38,000 families in the United States were receiving aid to families with dependent children because the father was absent from the home for reason of imprisonment.[1]

California Studies.--A 1964 study in California found that a great disparity existed in the use of probation between counties and that this disparity had its effect on state penal costs and workloads. Staff training was found to be a significant problem as was caseload. The large caseloads usually resulted in investigations not being accomplished. Another conclusion was that eight out of every 1,000 persons were under some kind of probation. The caseload totals were: 56,725 juveniles, 30,833 adult felons and 41,006 lower court cases. In studying the results of county use of the state diagnostic center, it was reported by some Judges that they had no returns, of those given probation, after use of the center. The Judges could send offenders to the center for ninety days and they would be returned with a complete history and a recommendation. Some of the recommendations of the study were:

(1) The state should help counties improve probation services.

(2) The state should assume the major responsibility and cost for training and certification.

---

[1] "Initial Findings of the 1961 Report on Characteristics of Recipients", Social Security Bulletin 26 (1963)

(3) The state should assist counties by continuing to provide free diagnostic services.

(4) Salaries should be based on education and responsibility.

The report concluded that the need for a probation training center was basic.[1]

According to a 1967 study, California has subsidized training for probation officers since 1953. In 1966, the California State Legislature approved a probation subsidy program under which the State pays the counties for results achieved on a performance principle. In the first year, twenty-nine of thirty-one counties were successful in reducing their commitments and had substantial earnings. In most cases the earnings substantially exceeded the cost of the new program. The actual reductions in commitments ranged from 38.8 percent to 86 percent with a median of 36.7 percent. A careful estimate is that 25 perce of those persons traditionally sent to prison as first commiments could instead be held in the community as probationers.[2]

A 1969 study concluded, "the best summary statement that can be made is that the total cost of local corrections (a system which handles 98 percent of the criminal justice intake each year, and supervises at least 75 percent of the total persons under state or local supervision on a given day)

---

[1]The State of California, The Board of Corrections Probation Study - Final Report, 1964

[2]Robert L. Smith, "Probation Subsidy: Success Story", Youth Authority Quarterly, Winter, 1967

for the 1967-68 fiscal year was $123 million, 15 percent of the total costs of the criminal justice system, and $1 million less than the total cost of state corrections." In support of this statement, it was found that the average cost per capita per year in the adult department of corrections was $2,861 (range from $1,844 to $3,679). The average yearly cost of parole for adults was $609. The average yearly cost for county probation, whether felony or misdemeanor, was about $250. The conservative estimate of the total cost of an average commitment episode in an adult prison was $8,800 if the offender is not returned from parole - and 30 percent returned within two years. The cost of a return could range from $13,000 to finish the term to $18,000 for a new commitment. The costs of a local commitment episode were unlikely to exceed $1,250 even if the probation supervision period is five years.

Available evidence indicated that at least 50 percent of the men entering prison each year may be no more serious offenders than many of those placed in local probation (including jail) systems. The percent of persons convicted in superior courts and committed to state institutions varied greatly among the thirteen largest California counties - from 11 percent to 36 percent. It was found that if all California counties were able to reduce their prison commitment rates to those already established by some large counties, commitments to prison statewide would be reduced by more than 60 percent.

According to the report, there is no evidence that increasing the use of probation would subject the public to any significantly increased danger. On the contrary, the increased use of local corrections which occurred in California in the last decade was found to be associated with no increase in serious crime among the population supervised. The felony "crime rate" among adult felony probationers under supervision in 1967 was the same as that for the total California population (2.5 percent).[1]

The Human Relations Agency of the Youth Authority reported in a 1970 study that an independent agency found, in reviewing the State Probation Subsidy, that at least 5,000 reductions in commitments could be attributed to the Probation Subsidy Program. The gross savings to the State were estimated to be from $9 million to $51 million. However, operational problems developed at the county level due to increased cost. This was considered to be due to the impact of inflation and due to subsidy rates being outdated. The $51 million estimate was based on the total reduction in expected commitments, and the $9 million estimate was based on the minimum that could be positively attributed to the probation subsidy.

It was found that the prison population declined - with a marked increase in the number of persons committed for

---

[1]Assembly Office of Research, California Legislature, Preliminary Report on the Costs and Effects of the California Criminal Justice System and Recommendations for Legislation to Increase Support of Local Police and Corrections Programs, Sacramento, 1969, April

crimes of violence. It was concluded that the smaller state institution population with a larger number of violence prone individuals required facilities with tighter security and increased staffing.

The study concluded that the subsidy program had no effect on jail population. In fact, the number of sentenced adult inmates in county jails and camps declined since 1965 while the number of unsentenced adult inmates increased by more than 20 percent. The study concluded that the effect on local schools was small due to most of the probationers being wage earners. The effect on welfare cost was not determined. The annual subsidy program cost was reported to be:

1966 - 67	$1,632,064
1967 - 68	4,072,208
1968 - 69	8,766,667
1969 - 70	$13,292,266

This cost was based on State payments to the counties of up to $4,000 per probationer per year depending on the average rate of commitment reduction as compared to the rate during the base years. In reply to questions, 70 percent of the counties reported that they would not use county funds to keep the enrichment program going at the 1970 level if earnings to the county dropped in 1971.[1]

The standard set the absolute maximum caseload that can be effectively handled by a deputy probation officer at fifty

---

[1]Department of the Youth Authority Human Relations Agency, Report on State Aid for Probation Services, State of California, October 1970

valid active supervision cases. The caseload prior to the subsidy program was two, three or four times the maximum in most counties. The subsidy does not underwrite the cost of the investigative process which precedes the granting of probation by the court. It is intended to provide service that is substantially above the usual or employ techniques previously untried in probation as a substitute for routine services. The criteria is not newness but improved quality of the service provided.

The standards established were as follows:

Personal standards - deputies in special supervision should be of good character with emotional maturity, intelligence dependability, good health, and a genuine interest in people and their problems. They should have a minimum education equivalent to graduation from an accredited college or university, with a major in the social or political sciences. Where possible, completion of a program in graduate training in social work is desired.

Workload for deputies - The maximum caseload should not be substantially above fifty valid active supervision cases. Each case should receive not less than three hours of service per month.

Supervisors workload - the maximum number of officers supervised by a full-time supervisor, working in a special supervision program, should not exceed six deputies. The maximum unit workload for a full-time supervisor working in a special supervision program shall not exceed 300 valid active supervision cases at any given time.

Classification - a system of classification must be submitted with any application submitted. The system must include a specific plan for the probationer and/or group of probationers and a system which the department's supervisors will be held responsible and accountable for, in carrying out the department's plan.

Stenographic - Clerical support - there shall be at least one clerical position for each three deputies and a full-time clerical position for each full-time supervisor. As an alternative for small caseloads, counties may employ one-half clerical position for every fifty cases under special supervision.

Supporting services - special contracts for psychiatric, psychological, dental, medical, employment, housing and other supporting services shall be evaluated on an individual basis.

Study and evaluation - counties may budget an amount not to exceed ten percent of the annual special supervision budget (excluding rent and equipment). Necessary records will be maintained.[1]

Texas Studies.--The Texas Adult Probation Project found that the average daily cost of keeping a person on probation in the five counties surveyed was $.49 or $178.75 per year.

---

[1]Department of Youth Aughority, Sacramento, California, 1969, Rules, Regulations, and Standards of Performance for Special Supervision Programs

Also, the average earnings of a probationer in the project was $378.00 per month or $4,536 per year. The 941 probationers studied had total earnings for the year of $4,145,804, based on a projection of the average monthly earnings. Mr. Garmon estimated the total cost of probation for one year in the project was $163,468.90 and that the cost to keep the same number of persons in prison (figured at a rate of $2.92 per man per day,) would have been $974,141.20.[1]

In 1969, Ronald Durian sampled 100 inmates in the Texas Department of Corrections. He found that 72.1 percent of wives worked during the incarceration of the husband. Fifty-five percent of the wives in Durian's sample worked full time - an increase of four percent over those that worked full-time prior to the incarceration. Fifty-seven percent of the wives received income from other sources - forty-five percent from aid to dependent children and twenty-three percent from parents and relatives. The median income per month of the husband prior to prison was approximately $500.00 and the median income for wives during the incarceration was approximately $350.00.[2]

---

[1]Report by Giles Garmon, Chief, Adult Probation Officer, Travis County, Texas Operational Project Director, Texas Adult Probation Project

[2]Ronald S. Durian, Inmates Impressions of the Effects of Incarceration Upon His Family, Thesis, Sam Houston State University, 1969

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Physical and Economic Factors in Counties

The purpose of this section is to compare the Texas counties that have probation and those that do not in terms of physical and economic factors. Although numerous studies have been conducted describing the cost of probation as an average for all the states or for a particular state, very few studies have been published which attempt to demonstrate the ability of a county to pay for added services. It could be argued that to coerce a county of limited means into establishing token probation service could be self defeating in that the salary paid would not be likely to attract persons with the necessary qualifications. Once the office is established, the public pressure decreases. In a state where no provision is made for training probation officers, the problem is compounded.

It would be extremely difficult to determine the set of conditions that would have to be present in order to determine whether a county can or cannot support probation service. Even the commonly used criteria of population base is not satisfactory when it is possible for several counties to combine

to establish service or when the population is concentrated in an urban area in one county and spread in rural areas in another. Or, a county with a small population may have valuable mineral resources that increases its ability to support public projects.

In analyzing the Texas counties that have probation and those that do not, five factors were chosen that were believed to be related to whether or not a county has probation for adult felons. These five factors were: population, wages, taxable property, manufacturing value and total income. The values used were those listed in the 1970-71 Texas Almanac which represents reports from the counties for the 1968-69 time period. The data for all 254 counties was analyzed to: (1) determine the mean of the values of each factor for those counties that have probation and the mean of the values of each factor for those counties that do not have probation, (2) run a "t" statistic to determine if there were significant differences with respect to each factor between counties having probation and those that did not have such services,and, (3) estimate the strength of the relationship between each factor and the appropriate category by utilizing the point biserial statistic. (The results of these analyses are shown in Table I).

The mean populations of the counties having probation and those not having probation were 64,141 and 12,160 respectively. This difference was found to be significant at the .01 level as shown by the results of the "t" test.

TABLE I

SIGNIFICANCE OF PHYSICAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS AS PROBATION OFFICE PREDICTORS

	Mean of Values in Counties		
	Probation (156)	No Probation (98)	All Counties
Population[1]	64,141	12,160	44,085
Wages paid[2]	$ 78,054,048	$ 7,652,190	$ 50,890,608
Manufacturing value[2]	$ 52,622,352	$ 4,273,585	$ 33,967,824
Taxable property[2]	$ 101,506,016	$ 24,413,163	$ 71,761,088
Total income[2]	$ 165,848,688	$ 26,775,808	$ 112,190,160

	Standard Deviation	Point Biserial	"t" Test
Population[1]	156,276	+0.16	-2.60**
Wages paid[2]	$ 285,759,744	+0.12	-1.92*
Manufacturing value[2]	$ 169,707,920	+0.14	-2.22**
Taxable property[2]	$ 223,721,536	+0.17	-2.70**
Total income[2]	$ 447,386,880	+0.15	-2.43**

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

[1]Data on population taken from 1970 Report of Population published by the Bureau of the Census

[2]Taken from 1970-71 Texas Almanac

The strength of the relationship between whether or not a county has probation and the population of the county is given by the point biserial statistic of +.16. This means that, as expected, counties with probation tend also to have the larger populations. Even though the point biserial was not an extremely large value, when it is coupled with the results of the "t" test, the hypothesis stating that a relationship exists between population size and probation status of counties is supported. Even though the hypothesis did not indicate a directional relationship, the data clearly indicates a definite direction.

Like the population factor, the factors of wages paid, manufacturing value, taxable property and total income all show similar results in the same direction. The results of the "t" test of the other factors did not differ from that of the factor of population except that the difference for wages paid was found to be significant at the .05 level. The results for the point biserial continued to show small but consistent relationships between each factor and whether or not a county had probation.

Internal Cost of Operating the Texas Department of Corrections

Discussion of Cost

There are several ways to define and compute the cost of operation of a prison system. One method is to define cost as the total value of all services rendered less the

value of income from those services. For example, the cost of raising a pig would include the value of the feed it consumed even if the feed was prison produced. Income would be derived from either reclassifying the pig to a hog or "selling" the meat to a prison unit for consumption. Using this method of computing cost, the Texas Department of Corrections had, in 1970, total expenses of $41,315,612.12, total income of $24,176,619.49 and an excess of cost over income of $17,138,992.63.

Another method is to list all cash expenditures and subtract the prison produced income. Using this method, in 1970, the Texas Department of Corrections had costs of operation of $28,196,424.87 and prison produced income of $11,057,423.24 for a net loss or cost of $17,138,992.63. There are advantages to computing cost in one of these two ways. However, the question this thesis asked is, "How much does the taxpayer of Texas pay each year to operate the Texas Department of Corrections?" To answer this question, a different method must be used.

It appeared desirable, when initiating the study of the cost of the Texas Department of Corrections, to gather information from other states and from the Federal Bureau of Prisons on the elements each use in computing cost. The replies to letters requesting information made it evident that it is not possible to make interstate comparisons. According to Fred Ward of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the Survey on Corrections found difficulty in

computing cost because of the income that is subtracted from operating expenses.[1] The Assembly Office of Research of the California Legislature expressed concern about accounting methods within California when comparing the cost reported by the Youth Authority ($3,000 plus per man per year) and the cost reported by the adult prison system ($288 per capita per year).[2] As another example, the cost to operate the U. S. Government Bureau of Prisons adult facilities was reported to be $10.44 per man per day.[3] And, the net cost to operate the Texas Deparment of Corrections in 1970 was reported to be $3.61 per man per day.[4] The difference in these figures cannot be fully explained by administrative efficiency and services provided.

It was expected that this problem could be overcome by looking at the cost of individual services and functions. However, this procedure was found not to be practical because most correctional accounting systems are not designed to provide cost by service or function and financial reports were not in sufficient detail to isolate this factor.

---

[1]Letter from Fred Ward to Robert L. Frazier, September, 1971

[2]Letter from Carol Crowther to Charles M. Friel, September, 1971

[3]Letter from Victor H. Evjen to Charles M. Friel, September, 1971

[4]Taken from a summary report of comparison of operations for the years 1965 through 1970 printed by the Texas Department of Corrections

The Texas Department of Corrections is one of the larger business and industrial enterprises in the state of Texas. Like a well managed mutual fund, it is diversified into many areas of interest. These include agriculture, cattle and horse raising, furniture repair, metal products, orthopedic prosthetics and many other products and services. In 1970, the Texas Department of Corrections showed income from inmate labor totaling more than $1.3 million. In the area of expenditures, the department spent over $5 million for raw materials of which approximately $1.5 million was spent for steel. The profits from all prison enterprises annually returns over $6 million to the state to offset a portion of the cost of the operation of the department.

In general, the financial operations of the department can be traced to four major funds. The total monetary activity (cash expenditures) of these funds exceeds $30 million per year. However, approximately one-third of this cash flow results from expenditures made to maintain programs that are self-supporting. That is, they are not dependent on yearly tax money to continue operation. Only one of the four funds is directly dependent on tax revenue, so that by limiting the calculations to this fund, it was possible to obtain information on the cost to the taxpayer. There was one exception to this in the area of capital equipment and fixed assets. It was necessary, for proper accounting procedure, to add the annual depreciation of fixed assets for all prison property rather than show the yearly expenditures for capital equipment and construction.

Table II shows the cost of operation of the Texas Department of Corrections for the past five years. All four of the major funds are discussed for purposes of comparison but the final cost figures are based only on the expenditures and income in the General Revenue Fund and depreciation of fixed assets. Cost information for the past five years was readily available on the operation of the Texas Department of Corrections but was not readily available to the author for all other state agencies. The five year cost for the Texas Department of Corrections was developed to determine if there were trends in the cost. The final estimate of the total cost of incarceration was developed for one year only (1970) due to the lack of information from other sources.

Mineral Lease Fund

This fund was established to provide a method of accounting for the income derived from lease of rights to the Texas Department of Corrections controlled land. The cost of operation under the Mineral Lease Fund is offset by cash income that is held in trust by the State to continue operations from year to year. The income is returned to the Texas Department of Corrections after the next year's expenditures are justified in the budget. Since this fund is self supporting, and the income is returned to the Texas Department of Corrections, it does not directly affect lowering the yearly outlay by the taxpayer. For this reason, the Mineral Lease Fund was not used in the computation of the cost to the taxpayer.

Industrial Revolving Fund

The Industrial Revolving Fund is similar to the Mineral Lease Fund in that income is used by the Texas Department of Corrections to continue industrial operations. Until recently, the Texas Department of Corrections could have up to $1.5 million in the treasury at year end under this fund. Any amount over $1.5 million could be transferred to the General Revenue Fund to reduce appropriations. During the period studied, this occurred only during 1968 at which time $250,000 was transferred. With the exception of 1968, all income earned by the Industrial Revolving Fund is returned to the Texas Department of Corrections and any balance in the treasury at year end is not used to directly reduce the cost to the taxpayer. For that reason, the transactions under this fund were not included in the cost to the taxpayer to operate the Texas Department of Corrections.

Education and Recreation Fund

Income from the Education and Recreation Fund is obtained from profits of internal programs such as the rodeo, commissaries, dog program, etc. Cash earned from these sources is used to operate many programs for inmates that might not be possible if they depended on appropriations. That is, this fund is also self-supporting and does not directly affect cost to the taxpayer and is therefore left out of calculations of cost.

General Revenue Fund

The General Revenue Fund is the primary source of direct cost to the taxpayer. Funds from this source pay, in large part, for the custodial and administrative portion of the day to day operations of the system. This fund also has income and this income is used by the state to directly reduce cost to the taxpayer for operations under the fund. Table II shows the expenditures and income under the General Revenue Fund for the years 1966 through 1970.

Net Cost of the Texas Department of Corrections Operations

Table III shows the net cost to the taxpayer each year under the General Revenue Fund for the year ending August 1966 through the year ending 1970. Also shown is the cost per man per year, the cost per man per day and the percent of increase over prior years.

Cost of Incarceration External to the Texas Department of Corrections

Expenditures by Supporting State and Federal Agencies

Several state agencies contribute to the programs in operation at the Texas Department of Corrections. For example, the Texas Education Agency pays for the operation of the Windham School District. Funds for this purpose are not included in the regular Texas Department of Corrections authorization. Other agencies include the Texas Employment Commission, which maintains employees at units of the Texas Department of Corrections and the Vocational Rehabilitation Commission.

TABLE II

GENERAL REVENUE FUND

Expenditures

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Salary	8,285,440.12	8,468,625.10	10,891,581.27	11,785,748.36	12,503,916.90
Operating Expense	5,148,586.49	5,271,711.93	6,232,660.03	5,593,548.53	6,907,841.33
Depreciation	1,791,061.34	1,991,449.61	2,027,588.73	2,151,492.62	2,310,806.86
Total	15,225,087.95	15,731,786.64	19,151,830.03	19,530,825.51	21,722,565.09

Income

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
From General Revenue Fund	1,905,035.72	1,716,310.84	1,391,835.29	1,791,489.11	877,289.98
From Industrial Revolving Fund*			250,000.00		
Total	1,905,035.72	1,716,310.84	1,641,835.29	1,791,489.11	877,289.98

*Transferred to General Revenue Fund

Note: All figures expressed in dollars

The expenditures of the Texas Education Agency were available from the State Auditors Report at the Texas Department of Corrections. The expenditures of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Welfare were obtained directly from the agencies concerned. Expenditures of the Texas Employment Commission were estimated after obtaining information on the number of employees in 1970.

Two other elements of cost had to be included. One of these was the matching funds that the state paid for employees retirement. This figure was obtained from the Director of Personnel at the Texas Department of Corrections. The other cost is the Texas taxpayers share of Federal Funds. The total of these Federal grants was $299,350.74 in 1970. It was assumed that the taxpayer of Texas paid his share of the Federal grants based on percentage of population. Since Texas has approximately 7 percent of the U. S. population, only this amount was included. The direct support cost of incarceration based on this information is shown in Table IV.

Indirect Cost of Incarceration

The indirect cost of incarceration was defined as those costs to the state associated with loss of the breadwinner. These costs were obtained by two methods.

The first method was to obtain information directly from the State Department of Welfare pertaining to the amount of money paid to families where the husband was in prison. In response to a request for this information, David J. Beard, Assistant to the Commissioner, had his staff survey 1 percent

sample of the January, 1971, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) caseload. It was found that 3.9 percent of the cases surveyed were cases in which the father was in prison. The average monthly grant to those families was $116.15. Mr. Beard also furnished the monthly caseload summary for 1970. This summary, and the data computed based on the average grant is shown in Table V.

The other method of obtaining indirect cost was to ask questions of a representative sample of 115 inmates at the Diagnostic Unit of the Texas Department of Corrections. The data sheet used to compile responses to the questions is attached as Appendix A (cf. Appendix A, pp. 65-66).

The first step in constructing the sample was to determine where individuals could be found who would be representative of the total prison population. After reviewing the Unit assisgnment criteria, it was determined that two methods would yield acceptable results and each had both advantages and disadvantages. One method would have been to take a random sample of the entire prison population. The other method involved interviewing a group of inmates at the Diagnostic Unit. All inmates committed to the Texas Department of Corrections are initially assigned to the Diagnostic Unit. Assuming that the commitment of inmates to the Diagnostic Unit by the counties is random in time, a representative sample of the total inmate population should be available. To locate this sample, a listing of all inmates in the unit was obtained. The list included over 700 numbers in inmate number sequence.

TABLE IV

COST OF INCARCERATION IN 1970 BASED ON AGENCIES IN DIRECT SUPPORT OF THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Expenditures		
Texas Education Agency	$	343,989.00
Employees Retirement		704,274.00
Texas Employment Commission . . .		60,000.00*
Vocational Rehabilitation		398,796.00
Federal Grants (State portion) . .		40,920.00
Total	$	1,547,980.00
Cost per man per year		119.00
Cost per man per day		.32

*Estimated based on six employees at $10,000 salary each

TABLE V

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Minimum caseload (January 1970)		50,315
Maximum caseload (December 1970)		81,369
Average caseload		64,692
Average grant	$	116.15
Percent with father in prison		3.9%
Number of families		2,523
Total average monthly grant (average x families)	$	293,046.00
Total estimated grant for 1970	$	3,516,557.00

In order to obtain a list that was very close to a numerical sequence, the lowest fifty numbers on the list were bypassed. The numbers of the next 124 inmates were utilized for the sample. This list represented close to 100 percent of the male inmates who were received over a span of approximately two weeks.

The interviews were held in a separate office where the inmate sat beside the interviewers desk. No other individuals were in the room when the interviews were conducted. Each interview required from three to five minutes and all were conducted over one weekend.

Of the one-hundred-twenty-four inmates selected, nine were not available for interview. Of the one-hundred-fifteen inmates actually interviewed, complete responses were obtained from one-hundred-six of the inmates. The one or two missing responses from each of the remaining nine inmates was due to interviewer error in recording.

Results of the Sample.--In Table VI is a listing of the factors used to compute the indirect cost of incarceration based on the sample. To obtain the cost information, each inmate in the sample was asked a total of eighteen basic questions. If the inmate indicated he had dependents which he supported prior to being arrested, he was asked an additional eight questions related to family status. Six of the twenty-six questions were used directly in the computation of cost.

The remainder of this section is concerned with the manner in which the responses to the six questions were used

to derive the indirect cost information. Complete responses to all of the questions can be found in Appendix B (cf. Appendix B, pp. 67-84) together with an analysis of variance of the relationship between several of the response groups.

TABLE VI

FACTORS USED TO COMPUTE INDIRECT COST

Total average inmate population in 1970	13,001
Inmates in the sample	115
Average wage per year	$ 5,928.00
Average months employed per year	8.34
Unit cost of State Home (year)	$ 2,634.00
Number of children in State Home	3
Average taxes paid on gross wages	2%

Table VII is a summary of the indirect cost of incarceration based on an extension of the statistics derived from the sample to the entire Texas Department of Corrections population in 1970. The methods used to compute the costs in Table VII are described in the paragraphs below.

Cost of Welfare.--In the sample, nineteen inmates (17 percent) reported that they knew their families were receiving aid to dependent children payments. This represented seventeen percent of the sample, or 2,210 families when projected for the entire population. This compares with the finding of 2,523 families using the data in the survey conducted by the State Department of Public Welfare. Of the

inmates in the sample, an additional eight reported that they thought their families were receiving payments. When these numbers were added to those who knew their families were on welfare, the total was twenty-one percent or 2,730 families when projected to the entire inmate population.

This projection compares favorably with the information based on the State Department of Public Welfare survey. Therefore, the estimate of $3,516,557.00 (see Table V) was used to represent the cost to the State for Aid to Families with Dependent Children in 1970.

TABLE VII

TOTAL INDIRECT COST OF INCARCERATION IN 1970

AFDC Cost	$ 3,516,557.00
Tax loss	1,541,598.00
Cost of State Home for children	880,292.00
Total indirect cost	5,938,447.00
Cost per man per year	457.00
Cost per man per day	1.25

State Home for Children.--In the sample, two inmates reported that a total of three children were in a State Home as a result of the inmate's incarceration. When projected to the entire inmate population, this was 121 inmates and 338 children.

The average cost of $2, 634.00 to house one child for one year was computed by averaging the cost reported for the three State Homes operated by the Texas Youth Council.[1] This comes to a total cost in 1970 of $880,292.00.

Tax Loss.--The tax loss was computed by determining the average number of months worked per year and the months available for work (to arrive at a percent of time employed), determining the gross wages paid per month when employed, and relating this information to the taxes normally paid to the state.[2]

Summary of the External Cost of Incarceration

The external cost of incarceration was defined, in general, as all oosts that were not included in the yearly budget of the Texas Department of Corrections. This includes the cost of agencies in direct support of the Department and the indirect cost associated with the loss of the bread-winner. This total shown in Table VIII, was derived by adding the elements in Table IV (Cost of Incarceration in 1970 Based on Agencies in Direct Support of the Texas Department of Corrections) to the elements in Table VII (Total Indirect Cost of Incarceration).

---

[1]1970 Annual Report of the Texas Youth Council

[2]1971 Federal Income Tax Form (Optional State Sales Tax Tables)

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL COST OF INCARCERATION

Cost of Direct Support (Table IV)	$ 1,547,980.00
Indirect Cost (Table VII)	5,938,447.00
Total External Cost	7,486,427.00
Cost per man per year	575.00
Cost per man per day	1.58

Total Cost of Incarceration in 1970

Table IX shows the total cost of incarceration in 1970 which was computed by adding the total of Table III (Cost to the Taxpayer of the Internal Operations of the Texas Department of Corrections) to the total of Table VIII (Summary of the External Cost of Incarceration). Also shown is the average cost per man per year, which was computed by dividing the total for the year by the average inmate population, and the cost per man per day which was computed by dividing the cost per man per year by 365.

The Cost of Probation for Adult Felons

Definition of Cost

To attempt to compare the funds expended yearly by the taxpayer with the amount presently being expended for adult felony probation was not found to be desirable for the purpose of this study. After surveying several probation offices, it

was evident that most offices were only aware of their expenses for salary and travel allowance. Also, the services provided by the different couties varied considerably. Some offices handle misdemeanor and juvenile probation along with adult felons and to attempt to determine the percent of expenses that should be charged to adult felony probation would be specious. Also, it was decided that it would probably be of more value to know what probation for adult felons would cost, if every county had an office staffed at or near the ratio of officers to offenders that is generally recommended, than to know what the costs are at present.

TABLE IX

TOTAL COST OF INCARCERATION IN 1970

Texas Department of Corrections Cost . . .	$ 20,845,275.00
External Cost of Incarceration	7,486,427.00
Total Cost	28,331,702.00
Cost per man per year	2,179.00
Cost per man per day	5.97

To arrive at the proper cost elements for a probation office and to determine how the cost data could be obtained, assistance was requested from the head of the Accounting

Department of the School of Business Administration at Sam Houston State University, and the Chief of Property Control of General Dynamics, Convair Aerospace Corporation in Fort Worth, Texas. These elements of cost are summarized in Table X and are discussed individually in the next section.

Probation Cost Model

Ratio of Officers to Probationers.--To determine the optimum number of officers to use in a probation office, it was necessary to predict the number of potential probationers based on some known factor and to decide what the proper ratio should be. The ratios recommended ranged from thirty-five, by the Presidents Commission, to seventy-five by the statutes of some states.[1] However, as was noted in Chapter II, the San Francisco Project found no significant difference in failure rate over a wide range of caseloads up to eighty-five.[2] All of the present caseloads in the counties surveyed were eighty or greater. Based on this review, it was decided to use a caseload of fifty per officer as the standard, assuming that each officer would conduct an average of two presentence investigations per month along with his

---

[1]The Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report on Corrections, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967

[2]National Institute of Mental Health, The San Francisco Project; A Study of Federal Probation and Parole, April 1969

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF PROBATION COST ELEMENTS

1. Ratio

   a. one officer for every 20,000 ($\pm$ 10,000) of population.

   b. maximum caseload of 300 under each supervisor

2. Staffing Pattern

   a. one supervisor for every six officers

   b. one clerk for every three officers

   c. one secretary for each supervisor and director/assistant director

   d. one director for every two supervisors

3. Salary (average) and allowances

	Salary	Allowance*
Officers	$10,200	$1,200
Clerks	5,000	
Secretaries	6,000	
Supervisors	12,000	1,200
Directors	14,000	1,200

*Counties with large area or maximum caseload should pay $1,800 per year.

4. Facility - 165 square feet per person @$4,80 per square foot per year - $792.

5. Telephone - $100 per employee per year

6. Operating expenses - $200 per employee per year

7. County paid benefits - 15 percent of salary

8. Equipment depreciation - $600 per person each 5 years equals $120 per employee per year

9. Payments by probationers - $10 per month per probation times 12 months times sixty-five percent

caseload supervision. Using the formula of the San Francisco Project, this would amount to a caseload of sixty per officer where each investigation was equal to five units of supervision and only active supervision cases are considered. This ratio seemed not only to be reasonable from the standpoint of proper supervision but also seemed to be a practical goal that could be achieved in many counties.

A review of available literature showed that probation population could be predicted based on the total population for a state. In California, it was found that eight of every 1,000 persons were on some kind of probation. Two out of every eight on probation were adult felons resulting in a probation population of over 30,000. In Dallas County, the ratio was three adult felons for every 1,000 of population. The average of the other counties surveyed was also over three per 1,000 population. This predictor seemed to work consistently with all but the smallest counties. In the small counties, the probation population probably fluctuates greater from year to year than would the probation population in larger counties. These ratios were averages and the result was to use a prediction factor of 2.5 probationers per 1,000 population. In other words, a population of 20,000 would result in fifty probationers (the recommended active caseload for one officer).

Based on this information, a formula was developed for use in computing caseload for any population. The formula is:

$$C_a = \frac{K\ Pa}{P_s O}$$

In the formula, C_a is the average caseload, K is a constant (50) representing the desired caseload for one officer, P_a is the population of the county, P_s is the standard population (20,000) that will create a caseload of fifty and 0 is the number of officers.

It can be seen that for every 20,000 of population, one additional probation officer is needed. However, populations do not always happen to be multiples of 20,000 and it is difficult to hire one and one-half officers for a population of 30,000. For that reason, it was assumed that an officer's caseload should vary to some extent in either direction. Starting with the base population of 20,000, this formula was solved for each additional 20,000 of population and for a population range 10,000 above and 10,000 below each additional 20,000. The complete results of this analysis, including 225 possible combinations of population up to 1,700,000 is shown in Appendix D (cf. Appendix D, pp. 89-105).

It was noted in this analysis that a county with a population of less than 10,000 would have a caseload too small and should combine with another county to obtain a better probation ratio. Also, a county of over 30,000 should have more than one officer in order to not substantially exceed the standard ratio.

Staffing Pattern.--The staffing pattern selected was the pattern recommended in California with minor modifications. This pattern was based on one supervisor for each six officers, one clerical position for each three officers and one full-time secretary for each supervisor position. The major modification

is the addition of the positions of Director and/or Assistant Director for each two supervisor positions. In computing caseload, all of these positions are overhead except the Officer positions. In counties with a staffing level of from two through five, one of the officers should be designated as the Chief Probation Officer, but in this case he is included when computing caseload. This complete pattern, up through the level required for a county with a population of 1,700,000 is shown in Appendix C. (cf. Appendix C, pp.85-88)

Salary.--Salaries were based on actual salaries paid in some counties in Texas and an evaluation of pay scales in government and in industry. These salaries are fairly consistent, in the mid-range, with salaries in government and industry but the starting scale and supervisor scale are considerably lower than positions of similar responsibility in industry.

For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that all probation officers would be college graduates. Officers below supervisor in counties of less than 100,000 population would average two years of experience and supervisors would average five years of experience. Officers below supervisor in counties with population over 100,000 would have an average of three years experience and supervisors would have an average of seven years experience. The salary for clerks was based on the average salary scale in business and industry. The average salary in each category was used in the cost model. That is, some salaries would be less and some would be greater

than the average used. The variance would be based on education and experience.

Travel Allowance.--Travel allowance was based on the amount currently being paid in counties with probation service. The standard rate is $100 per month for each officer. However, counties with large area or maximum caseload should consider paying $150 per month.

Cost of Facility.--Standard accounting practice demanded that each office be charged a portion of the cost to the taxpayer of the total outlay for rent or construction. It was not possible to determine a proper charge for depreciation due to lack of information on construction cost. However, it was found that an acceptable practice is to use the cost of rental of similar office space as a substitute for depreciation cost.

Information on the average cost per square foot of office space was obtained by writing to the Chamber of Commerce in three cities. It was reported by these cities (Bryan, Austin and Dallas) that the cost per square foot ranged from $3.00 to $6.60 per year. Based on this data, an annual facility cost of $4.80 per square foot per year was selected. It can be noted that this will result in a somewhat lower total than actual for large cities and a higher estimate than the actual in smaller cities.

The number of square feet of office space per individual (165) was arrived at by measuring the space available in Austin, Bryan and Dallas and dividing by the number of people.

This information was adjusted based on discussion with the heads of each office and discussions with the Chief of Facilities at General Dynamics, Fort Worth pertaining to acceptable minimum standards. This figure is an average that includes aisle space, washrooms, etc. The $4.80 per square foot rent cost includes building maintenance and all utilities except telephone.

Telephone and Operating Supplies.--The amount to be charged for telephone bills was computed based on actual expenditures of the three offices surveyed. The amount paid in 1970 divided by the number of employees was approximately $100.

Operating supplies expense could not be obtained for the Brazos County Office because it is a lump sum for the court house. The average in the other two counties surveyed was $200 per employee per year.

County Paid Benefits.--It was assumed for the Cost Model that each county has a retirement system in which the county pays a portion of the cost. It was also assumed that each county paid for an insurance policy on each employee. The total cost of these benefits plus the county portion of social security cost in Dallas County was 15 percent of salary. This figure of 15 percent was cused in the model.

Equipment Cost.--The cost of equipment is based on the depreciation principle. It was estimated that the cost of office equipment per person was $600, (cost of desk, chair, file, typewriter, etc.) and that this equipment would be

replaced every five years. Based on this data, the cost of equipment per person per year was found to be $120.

Payments by Probationers.--Most counties collect a fee of $10.00 per month per probationer. If the average caseload of Dallas County in 1970 is multiplied by $10.00 and by twelve months the result is $508,800. However, Dallas County collected only $318,000 in fees during 1970. This was because the probation fee varies, not all probationers pay a fee and due to probation revocation. Also, some probationers are out of state being supervised by other offices and some out of state probationers are being supervised in Dallas County. However, the expected income to a county from this source an be estimated based on knowing the average loss experienced in the counties surveyed. It was determined, using this method that an average income of sixty-five percent of total possible income can be expected.

Summary of Probation Cost

In Table XI is a summary of the estimated total cost of probation in Texas based on the ground rule that all counties, or groups of counties, have probation service at an approximate ratio of fifty adult felony probationers per officer. The cost per man per year ranged from a low of $203.39 to a high of $405.73. The amount of $274.00 was selected because it was the closest to the cost that would be associated with the mean population of all counties.

It should be noted that this cost includes the cost of facilities and equipment. This is the cost that was used in

comparisons with the cost of incarceration. However, in order for county and state governments to visualize a cost that is closer to budget cost, the data was analyzed to compute cost based on all the elements except facility and equipment cost. Since many, if not most, probation offices are located in existing "rent free" facilities using existing equipment, this information would be more helpful to a county that is comparing their situation to a "model". Table XII shows the total estimated cost of probation when facility and equipment cost is removed, and Appendix E (cf. Appendix E, pp. 106-122) shows a complete display of cost for each population range. In Table XIII is an example of the cost model for a population of 20,000 using both methods of computing cost. Using the formulas and cost elements, the caseload and cost for any county population can be computed.

TABLE XI

COST OF A MODEL PROBATION SYSTEM FOR TEXAS

Estimated average number of probationers* . . .	28,000
Cost per man per year**	$274.00
Total estimated cost for one year	$7,672,000.00
Cost per man per day	$ .75

*1970 population of Texas (11,200,000) divided by 1,000 and multiplied by 2.5 (the number of probationers per 1,000 population).

**Based on the cost of a county with 40,000 population (the mean of the populations of all counties is 44,085).

TABLE XII

COST OF PROBATION EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST

Estimated average number of probationers . . .	28,000
Cost per man per year*	$274.00
Total estimated cost for one year	$ 6,916,000.00
Cost per man per day	$ .68

*Based on the mean population of all Texas Counties

TABLE XIII

COST MODEL FOR A COUNTY WITH POPULATION OF 20,000

Expenditures		
Salary		
Probation Officer (1) . . .	$10,200.00	$10,200.00
Clerk (1)	5,000.00	5,000.00
Travel Allowance	1,200.00	1,200.00
Telephone	200.00	200.00
Operating Supplies	400.00	400.00
County paid benefits	2,280.00	2,280.00
Facility (Rent/Depreciation).	1,584.00	
Equipment Depreciation . . .	240.00	
Subtotal	$21,104.00	$19,280.00
Income		
Payments by Probationers . .	3,900.00	3,900.00
Expenses not off-set by income . .	$17,204.00	$15,380.00
Cost per man per year	344.08	307.60
Cost per man per day	.94	.84

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARISON OF THE COST OF INCARCERATION AND THE COST OF PROBATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE SUPPORT

COST COMPARISONS

Difference in Cost

Table XIV shows the difference between the cost of incarceration in 1970 and the cost of a model probation system for adult felons. Also shown is the average daily population served by the Texas Department of Corrections and the estimated average daily adult felon probation population that would have been achieved if the model probation system had been in operation for several years.

Some additional comparisons can be made based on the cost of parole and length of sentence. For example, if a man was given a five year sentence and he served three years in the Texas Department of Corrections and two years on parole, the cost of the commitment episode would be $6,927.00.[1]

---

[1]According to the Twenty-Third Annual Statistical Report of the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles, the cost to supervise one man for one year was $195 in 1970. This was the figure used in the example. However, when considering only the active supervision cases, the cost per man per year was $401. It should be noted that of the 5,259 inmates released from the Texas Department of Corrections in 1970, a total of only 2,058 of these were released on parole.

The cost to maintain the same person on probation for five years would be approximately $1,370.00.[1] This amounts to a difference in cost of $5,557 over the five year period. Assuming that the institution of the model probation system would have slowed the rate of growth in the Texas Department of Corrections so that an additional 3,000 men were placed on probation, this would amount to a one year savings of $5,715,000. Or, if the 3,000 men served three years in prison and two years on parole as opposed to five years on proabion, the difference in cost would be $16,671,000 for the five year period.[2]

Cost Elements not Included

In computing the cost of probation, some consideration should be given to including the cost incurred by other county agencies that play a supporting role to the probation office. These might include foster homes, psychiatric services, and others. Also, when considering the use of heroin, a strong case could be made for subtracting that portion of the cost of the habit that is found to be above wages from the cost benefits of probation. However, the wife or family may be providing the additional money required or the person

---

[1] See Table XIV

[2] California found that they not only reduced the rate of commitment, but actually reduced the prison population. It can be noted that the average prison population used in this study was 13,001 (in 1970). Latest information indicates that the population in the Texas Department of Corrections has gone over 16,000.

could have been living in a commune which pooled its resources.

It could also be expected that the cost per man per day in the Texas Department of Corrections would go up if the population decreased. California found that with their reduced prison population they had a higher proportion of inmates who were violence prone individuals requiring greater security. This dramatic reduction in rate of prison commitment could not be expected in Texas in so short a time, due to the difference in programs, but a definite change would take place.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF PROBATION AND INCARCERATION COST

Average inmate population in 1970	13,000
Estimated probation population	28,000
Total cost of incarceration in 1970	$ 28,331,702.
Total cost of model probation system for one year	$ 7,672,000.*
Difference in cost	$ 20,659,702.
Cost per man per year (Probation)	$ 274.
Cost per man per year (Incarceration) . . .	$ 2,179.
Difference in cost per year	$ 1,905.
Cost per man per day (Probation)	$ .75
Cost per man per day (Incarceration) . . .	$ 5.97
Difference in cost per day	$ 5.22

*Includes facility and equipment cost

Comparison of Cost of a Present Probation Office with the Model

Although it was not found to be desirable or possible to compute the present cost of probation in Texas, some comparisons can be made using one of the counties surveyed as an example. In this county, the expenditure per man per year was found to be forty-nine dollars as opposed to a net cost of $247.00 in the model (does not include facility or equipment cost). The expenditure per man per day was thirteen cents as opposed to a cost of sixty-eight cents in the model. The caseload averaged 184 per officer, including the director, whereas in the cost model the caseload is fifty excluding supervisors and directors.

This actually was not the real comparison that could be made for it was found that the probationers paid in more in fees than the county spent on supervision. The cost of operations was approximately two-thirds of the total collected in fees. In this county, an additional forty-six officers are required, in addition to increased administrative staff, in order to approximate the model.

The success of this office cannot be denied but its existence under these conditions may actually be a hindrance to the state ever approaching the potential which can be expected from properly staffed probation. Doesn't the relative cost of probation as opposed to incarceration justify the increased staff? If the counties are left on their own to support the entire program, the answer may well be "no".

Need for State Support

Past actions by the state of Texas, in studying the appropriations necessary to support a state operated probation system, have demonstrated the willingness of the legislature to live up to its obligation to provide monetary support to probation (see page 8). Many people have argued that a State operated system is necessary for full coverage of all counties. Operation by the State, however, has disadvantages. One of these is in the area of coordination with county agencies other than probation.

The primary effort by the State should be in providing assistance to counties in such a way that both the county and the State benefit. It has been shown that it is cost effective to increase the use of probation. If a man were placed in the Texas Department of Corrections for three years and then put on parole for two years, it cost the State $6,537. If the same man were placed on probation for five years, the county pays $1,370 and the state pays nothing. In this case, it could be argued that the county is, in effect, paying for a state service. If, by extending probation service to all counties and expanding probation supervision quality while decreasing the ratio of officers to probationers, the population of the Texas Department of Corrections could have been maintained at the 1970 level, (a reduction of 3,000) the savings to the State for these 3,000 cases would have been $5,715,000 for one year. However, under the present system, the counties would pay the total cost of $822,000.

The only way in which the taxpayer will realize this savings is for the State to share the savings with the counties. In the process of sharing, the State can insure that probation is expanded and that many of the advantages of a State operated system are achieved without losing the advantages of having the counties administer the program.

A Proposal for Sharing Savings

It is proposed that the State Legislature establish the laws and appropriate the funds necessary to pay two-thirds of the cost of probation for adult felons. The laws should provide for insuring that minimum standards of caseload, training and education are achieved in order to obtain State support. It is estimated that the yearly budget of the State for this program would be $4,459,808 but $5,715,000 would be saved by the State due to the expected decrease in the rate of commitments to the Texas Department of Corrections. The County portion of the cost would total $2,297,478.

Probation Coordination Board

A board should be established at the state level to establish policy and standards necessary to implement a program of state support of county probation. The board should be composed of approximately five members and be commensurate in salary and responsibility with the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

Probation Coordination Office

An office should be established at the state level to coordinate the functions of the county probation offices.

The functions would include insuring compliance with standards and policy, monitoring funds use, making courtesy checks of probation offices upon request and coordinating training. The personnel to fill this office should be selected from among probation officers who have demonstrated management ability and from the staffs of Universities. A typical staffing pattern for this office is shown in Table XV. This office would establish guidelines for the program that would be approved by the Board prior to funds being distributed.

TABLE XV

PROBATION COORDINATION OFFICE

Personnel	
Director	1
Assistant Director for Training	1
Assistant Director for Financial Planning	1
Research and Training Personnel	3
Budget Personnel	2
Secretaries	3
Clerks	3
Equipment	
State owned automobiles as required	

Orientation Program

An orientation program for felon and county court personnel, specifically covering the probation program, should

be held each year. This activity would take place at the training facility and be administered by the Probation Coordination Office. Expenses should be paid for by the State.

State Operated Training Facility

A State operated training facility should be established to conduct training in probation supervision and probation office administration. One of the major functions of the Probation Coordination Office during the first years of operation would be in assuring that probation personnel are given training. Provisions should be made for cutting off funds to counties if training requirements are not met each year by a percentage of the personnel in each office.

Two levels of training should be offered. A basic level for new officers and an advanced level for officers who have attended the basic level training. During the first months after establishment of the Probation Coordination Office, funds should be allocated to the Institute to develop the basic level training program and the orientation program.

Recommended Procedure

The Legislature should commit itself to the cost sharing program by taking the following actions:

1. Establish and fund the Probation Coordination Board and the Probation Coordination Office.

2. Provide funds to initiate the training and orientation programs.

3. Direct the Probation Coordination Board to submit for approval specific guidelines for operation of the program.

4. Direct the Probation Coordination Board to submit a specific budget for allocating funds to counties for the following year and to provide a five year plan for allocating funds.

5. Provide for appointment, by the Governor, of the Board members.

The Probation Coordination Board would perform the following functions:

1. Establish guidelines for the operation of the program.

2. Review, approve and submit the budget for the opeation of the training facility, the Probation Coordination Office and the subsidy funds.

3. Monitor the program operation.

Note: The Board Chairman might also be the Director of the Probation Coordination Office.

The Probation Coordination Office should perform the following functions during the first year of operation:

1. Provide funds to the training facility to plan the training and orientation programs.

2. Develop procedures, within the guidelines established by the Board, for allocating funds to each county or to groups of counties.

3. Coordinate with the counties to insure the county portion of funding is made available.

4. Publicize the training and orientation programs.

5. Develop and submit reports required by the Board.

TABLE XVI

RECOMMENDED BUDGET FOR PROBATION COORDINATION OFFICE

Salary[1]	
Director	$ 18,000
Assistant Director (2)	32,000
Secretaries (3)	18,000
Training and Budget Personnel (5)	60,000
Clerks (3)	15,000
Equipment (Office and auto)	15,000
Operating Expenses (Office and travel)	15,000
TOTAL	$ 173,000
Funds allocated to Counties[2]	$ 1,000,000
Training Facility Funds[3]	
Travel expenses	$ 10,000
Instruction	8,000

[1]Funds spent the first year will depend on when personnel are hired.

[2]Funds to be allocated to counties hould be appropriated starting with the second year ($1,000,000) and increase each year as required, up to the total estimated State portion of $4,459,808 within three years.

[3]Two day orientation program (two each year) and ive day training program (two each year).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

California found that improving County probation through an enrichment program financed by the State, had a direct impact on the rate of commitment to prison. The net result was a savings to the State of $5,000,000 to $51,000,000 due to the difference in cost of the two approaches to correction of offenders. Also, the risk involved was not found to be significant - the "crime rate" among probationers being the same as the rate in the general population.

The present county administered system of probation for adult felons in Texas is characterized by lack of service, understaffing and high caseloads and as a result, the prison population has increased at a much higher rate than the rate of increase in the general population. One of the basic reasons for this poor state of affairs in probation appears to be the inability of the counties to provide sufficient funds within their own resources to provide adequate probation service. It appears that financial assistance from the State is necessary for further expansion and improved quality in probation.

It was found that the cost of incarceration in Texas is significantly higher than would be the cost of a model, county operated, probation system. And, the initial impact on the

State in paying two-thirds of the cost of a model system would be offset by the reduction in the cost that would have been incurred due to incarceration. Thus, the significant expansion and improvement of probation, through State subsidy, would result in little immediate increase in cost to the taxpayer and the hard cash saved the taxpayer over a ten year period could easily exceed $50,000,000.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study the following recommendations are made:

(1) That the State subsidize two-thirds of the cost of a "Model" county administered probation system for adult felons.

(2) That the standards of probation in Texas be improved through establishment of a State administered training and orientation facility.

(3) That a Probation Coordination Office be established at the State level to administer the subsidy program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Correctional Association. Manual of Correctional Standards. Washington, D.C.: The American Correctional Association, 1966.

Assembly Office of Research, California Legislature. Preliminary Report on the Costs and Effects of the California Criminal Justice System and Recommendations for Legislation to Increase Support of Local Police and Corrections Programs. Sacramento, 1969.

Board of Corrections, State of California. The Board of Corrections Probation Study - Final Report. The State of California, 1964.

Committee on Standards for Adult Probation, Professional Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Standards and Guides for Adult Probation. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1962.

Department of Youth Authority, Rules, Regulations and Standards for Special Supervision Programs. State of California, 1969.

Department of Youth Authority, Human Relations Agency. Report on State Aid for Probation Services. State of California, 1970.

Division of Adult Probation of the Texas Probation and Parole Association. Adult Probation Directory, 1971.

Durian, Ronald S. Inmates Impressions of the Effects of Incarceration Upon His Family, Thesis, Sam Houston State University, 1969.

Glueck, Eleanor and Glueck, Sheldon, 500 Criminal Careers, New York, 1930.

National Institute of Mental Health. The San Francisco Project: a Study of Federal Probation and Parole. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.

Smith, Robert L., "Probation Subsidy: Success Story." Youth Authority Quarterly, Winter, 1967.

Ward, Frederic, Extending Adult Probation Services to All Communities, Commitment and the Correctional Process, 1951 Yearbook of the National Probation and Parole Association, edited by Margorie Bell.

APPENDIX A

ECONOMIC LOSS/GAIN DUE TO INCARCERATION

Column	Data
1 - 2	Age
3	Race 1=W, 2=N, 3=M
4 - 7	() () () () Maximum expiration date, month/year
8 - 11	() () () () Years and months to maximum release
12 - 20	() () () () () () () () () Occupation I
21 - 29	() () () () () () () () () Occupation II
30 - 31	() () Months worked in two years prior to being busted
32 - 33	() () Months available for work during same two Years
34 - 36	() () () Future county of residence, one through 254=county, 0=out of state
37 - 40	() () () () Previous average gross wage per month
41 - 42	() () Longest single employment span in two years prior
43 - 44	() () Number of jobs held in two years prior
45	() Marital status, 1=single, 2=married, 3=divorced, 1+ a number >0 in column 46-47=common law marriage
46 - 47	() () Number of dependents (wife, children)
48	() Is wife in institution, 1=yes, 2=no
49	() Are any children in a State Home as a result of inmates incarceration, 1=yes, 2=no
50 - 51	() () Number of children in State Home
52	() Did wife work prior to inmates incarceration, 1=full time, 2=part time, 3=no
53	() Does wife work now, 1=full time, 2=part time, 3=no

Column	Data
54	() Is family on welfare? 1=yes, 2=no
55 - 56	() () Number of children receiving payments
57	() Does inmate receive VA, retirement or Social Security, 1=yes, 2=no
58 - 60	() () () Amount of benefit (month)
61	() Is inmate an alcoholic, 1=yes, 2=no
62	() Was inmate on heroin, 1=yes, 2=no
63 - 66	() () () Dollar amount of habit (day)
74 - 79	() () () () () () Inmate number
80	() Card number

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES BY INMATES IN SAMPLE

AGE

Group	Frequency	Percentage
15-19	25	22.60
20-24	31	26.95
25-29	24	20.86
30-34	13	11.30
35-39	7	6.08
40-49	8	6.95
50-54	5	4.34
Total	115	100.00

Median age of all inmates was 27 years.

RACE

Group	Frequency	Percentage
White	57	50.00
Black	29	25.00
Mexican	29	25.00
Total	115	100.00

YEARS TO MAXIMUM RELEASE

Years	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 2	22	19.12
2 - 4	41	35.66
4 - 6	22	19.12
6 - 8	8	6.95
8 - 10	8	6.95
10 - 12	3	2.60
12 - 14	0	0.00
14 - 16	2	1.73
16 - 18	1	.86
18 - 20	4	3.47
20 - 22	0	0.00
22 - 24	1	.86
24 - 26	1	.86
Life (counted as 50 years)	1	.86
Unknown	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

Median for all groups was 5.62 years

OCCUPATION

Group	Frequency	Percentage
Automotive	18	15.62
Building trades	22	19.12
Clerical/Service/ Sales	12	10.41
General labor	31	26.95
Light Manufacture/ Repair	9	7.81
Landscape/farming	2	1.73
Manufacturing	5	4.34
Marine	3	2.60
Professional sports	1	.86
Oil field/pipeline	2	1.73
Food service	9	7.81
School	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

FUTURE (PLANNED) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE

County	Frequency	Percentage
Bastrop	1	.86
Bexar	1	.86
Brazoria	1	.86
Callahan	2	1.73
Cameron	1	.86
Castro	1	.86
Coleman	1	.86
Crane	1	.86

County	Frequency	Percentage
Dallas	17	14.78
Denton	2	1.73
Ector	5	4.34
El Paso	10	8.69
Fannin	1	.86
Galveston	3	2.60
Hale	2	1.73
Harris	21	18.26
Hidalgo	4	3.47
Jefferson	4	3.47
Kendall	1	.86
Kimble	1	.86
Kleberg	1	.86
Lubbock	1	.86
Matagorda	2	1.73
Midland	2	1.73
Newton	1	.86
Nolan	3	2.60
Nueces	1	.86
Tarrant	1	.86
Taylor	1	.86
Tom Green	5	4.34
Travis	2	1.73
Smith	1	.86
Wichita	1	.86
Young	1	.86

County	Frequency	Percentage
Out-of-State	10	8.68
Unknown	2	1.73
Total-34	115	100.00

LONGEST SINGLE EMPLOYMENT SPAN IN TWO YEARS PRIOR TO BEING BUSTED

Months	Frequency	Percentage
0	4	3.47
1	3	2.60
2	7	6.08
3	9	7.82
4	4	3.47
5	5	4.34
6	11	9.56
7	3	2.60
8	6	5.21
9	5	4.34
10	3	2.60
11	0	0.00
12	12	10.43
13	3	2.60
14	1	.86
15	0	0.00
16	3	2.60
17	0	0.00
18	5	4.34

Months	Frequency	Percentage
19	1	.86
20	1	.86
21	1	.86
22	0	0.00
23	0	0.00
24	28	24.34
Total	115	100.00

Median of longest job for all inmates was 11.84 months.

NUMBER OF JOBS HELD DURING TWO YEARS PRIOR TO BEING BUSTED

Jobs	Frequency	Percentage
0	4	3.47
1	46	40.00
2	24	20.86
3	20	17.39
4	13	11.30
5	3	2.60
6	2	1.73
7	0	0.00
8	1	.86
9	0	0.00
10	0	0.00
11	0	0.00
12	1	.86
13	0	0.00

Jobs	Frequency	Percentage
14	0	0.00
15	0	0.00
16	0	0.00
17	0	0.00
18	0	0.00
19	0	0.00
20	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

Median for all inmates was 2.37 jobs.

MONTHS AVAILABLE FOR WORK IN TWO YEARS PRIOR TO BEING BUSTED

Months	Frequency	Percentage
0	1	.86
1	0	0.00
2	2	1.73
3	1	.86
4	0	0.00
5	2	1.73
6	1	.86
7	0	0.00
8	0	0.00
9	2	1.73
10	1	.86
11	0	0.00
12	3	2.60

Months	Frequency	Percentage
13	1	.86
14	0	0.00
15	0	0.00
16	1	.86
17	0	0.00
18	0	0.00
19	0	0.00
20	2	1.73
21	0	0.00
22	0	0.00
23	0	0.00
24	98	85.20
Total	115	100.00

Median for all inmates was 21.8.

MONTHS WORKED IN TWO YEARS PRIOR TO BEING BUSTED

Months	Frequency	Percentage
unknown	1	.86
0	3	2.60
1	2	1.73
2	4	3.47
3	4	3.40
4	0	0.00
5	3	2.60
6	7	6.08

Months	Frequency	Percentage
7	2	1.73
8	5	4.34
9	4	3.40
10	5	4.34
11	1	.86
12	7	6.08
13	2	1.73
14	3	2.60
15	4	3.40
16	4	3.40
17	0	0.00
18	3	2.60
19	3	2.60
20	6	5.21
21	2	1.73
22	1	.86
23	1	.86
24	38	33.04
Total	115	100.00

Median for all inmates was 15 months.

AVERAGE GROSS WAGE PER MONTH WHEN WORKING DURING TWO YEARS PRIOR TO BEING BUSTED

Group	Frequency	Percentage
unknown	3	2.60
0-199	5	4.34

Group	Frequency	Percentage
200- 399	37	32.18
400- 599	35	30.45
600- 799	17	14.78
800- 999	13	11.30
1000-1199	1	.86
1200-1399	1	.86
1400-1599	2	1.73
1600-1799	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

Median for all inmates was $494.00

MARITAL STATUS

Group	Frequency	Percentage
Single	55*	47.82
Married	38	33.04
Divorced	22	19.13
Total	115	100.00

*Twenty-one of this group were Common Law marriages.

NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS

Dependents*	Frequency	Percentage
0	38	33.04
1	12	10.41
2	34	29.59
3	15	13.03
4	9	7.82
5	5	4.34

Dependents*	Frequency	Percentage
6	1	.86
7	0	0.00
8	0	0.00
9	0	0.00
10	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

*Common law wife and children counted.

FAMILIES ON WELFARE

Status	Frequency	Percentage
unknown	8	6.95
yes	19*	16.52
no	88	76.51
Total	115	100.00

*Includes two out-of-state.

CHILDREN RECEIVING WELFARE PAYMENTS

Children	Frequency	Percentage
0	96	83.47
1	7	6.08
2	5	4.34
3	3	2.60
4	1	.86
5	1	.86

Children	Frequency	Percentage
1*	1	.86
4*	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

*out-of-state

WIVES IN INSTITUTION

None

INMATES WITH CHILDREN IN A STATE HOME AS A RESULT OF INMATES INCARCERATION

Occurrences	Frequency	Percentage
no	113	98.27
yes	2	1.73
Total	115	100.00

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN A STATE HOME AS A RESULT OF INMATES INCARCERATION

Children	Frequency	Percentage
0	113	98.27
1	1	.86
2	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

WIVES WORKING PRIOR TO INMATES INCARCERATION

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Full-time	17	14.78
Part-time	10	8.69

Status	Frequency	Percentage
no	88	76.53
Total	115	100.00

WIVES WORKING NOW

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Full-time	27	23.47
Part-time	7	6.08
no and unknown	81	70.45
Total	115	100.00

INMATES RECEIVING VETERANS AID, RETIREMENT OR SOCIAL SECURITY

Status	Frequency	Percentage
yes	3	2.60
no	112	97.39
Total	115	100.00

AMOUNT OF BENEFIT (V.A., ETC.) PER MONTH

Benefit(dollars)	Frequency	Percentage
none	112	97.39
96	1	.86
104	1	.86
237	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

NUMBER OF ALCOHOLICS

Status	Frequency	Percentage
yes	9	7.82
no	106	92.18
Total	115	100.00

INMATES ON HEROIN DAILY

Status	Frequency	Percentage
yes	17	14.78
no	98	85.22
Total	115	100.00

DAILY COST OF HEROIN

Cost(dollars)	Frequency	Percentage
none	98	85.20
15	1	.86
20	1	.86
25	2	1.73
30	3	2.60
35	1	.86
40	3	2.60
50	3	2.60
80	1	.86
85	1	.86
100	1	.86
Total	115	100.00

Total daily cost for the sample was $745.00 or $271,925.00 per year. When projected for 14.78% of the 13,001

inmate population the cost of heroin for 1,921 inmates was $521,367,925.00 per year.

AGE GROUP RELATION TO GROSS WAGES PER MONTH

Age Group	Group Size	Average Wage	Standard Deviation
15-19	25	$ 362	$ 203
20-24	31	442	206
25-29	24	580	325
30-34	13	657	446
35-39	7	605	309
40-44	8	477	217
45-49	5	572	134
50-54	2	440	84

Average age of all inmates was 27 years. Average wage of all inmates was $494 with a standard deviation of $282.

RELATION OF RACE TO GROSS WAGES PER MONTH WHEN WORKING

Group	Wages (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
White	587.105	305.243	57
Black	470.000	234.799	29
Mexican	337.172	204.163	29

RELATION OF RACE TO COMMON LAW MARRIAGE

Group	Total Inmates	Common Law Marriages	Percentage of Group
White	24	6	25.00
Black	18	10	55.55

Group	Total Inmates	Common Law Marriages	Percentage of Group
Mexican	13	5	38.46
Total	55	21	

Thirty-eight percent of all single inmates were married by common law.

RELATION OF AGE TO HEROIN USE

Group	Age (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
users	24.737	10.826	19
non-users	27.667	8.290	96

RELATION OF HEROIN USE TO NUMBER OF JOBS HELD IN TWO YEARS

Group	Jobs (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
users	2.158	1.425	19
non-users	2.417	2.512	96

RELATION OF HEROIN USE TO TOTAL MONTHS WORKED IN TWO YEARS PRIOR

Group	Months (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
users	10.526	8.455	19
non-users	16.000	7.862	96

RELATION OF HEROIN USE TO LONGEST ONE JOB WAS HELD IN TWO YEARS PRIOR

Group	Job length (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
users	8.105	7.593	19
non-users	12.583	8.332	96

RELATION OF HEROIN USE TO GROSS WAGES PER MONTH WHEN WORKING

Group	Wage (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
users	336.632	180.592	19
non-users	525.802	290.152	96

RELATION OF ALCOHOL TO NUMBER OF JOBS HELD IN TWO YEARS PRIOR

Group	Jobs (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
alcoholic	3.444	6.267	9
non-alcoholic	2.212	1.716	106

RELATION OF ALCOHOL TO LONGEST ONE JOB WAS HELD IN TWO YEARS PRIOR

Group	Jobs (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
alcoholic	10.222	10.521	9
non-alcoholic	12.465	8.223	106

RELATION OF ALCOHOL TO TOTAL MONTHS WORKED IN TWO YEARS PRIOR

Group	Months (Mean)	Standard Deviation	Group size
alcoholic	12.889	10.741	9
non-alcoholic	15.596	8.009	106

APPENDIX C

STAFFING PATTERN

Officers	Clerks	Supervisors	Secretaries	Directors
1	1			
2	1			
3	1			
4	1			
5	1			
6	2	1	1	
7	2	1	1	
8	2	1	1	
9	3	1	1	
10	3	1	1	
11	3	1	1	
12	4	2	3	1
13	4	2	3	1
14	4	2	3	1
15	5	2	3	1
16	5	2	3	1
17	5	2	3	1
18	6	3	4	1
19	6	3	4	1
20	6	3	4	1
21	7	3	4	1
22	7	3	4	1
23	7	3	4	1
24	8	4	6	2

Officers	Clerks	Supervisors	Secretaries	Directors
25	8	4	6	2
26	8	4	6	2
27	9	4	6	2
28	9	4	6	2
29	9	4	6	2
30	10	5	7	2
31	10	5	7	2
32	10	5	7	2
33	11	5	7	2
34	11	5	7	2
35	11	5	7	2
36	12	6	9	3
37	12	6	9	3
38	12	6	9	3
39	13	6	9	3
40	13	6	9	3
41	13	6	9	3
42	14	7	10	3
43	14	7	10	3
44	14	7	10	3
45	15	7	10	3
46	15	7	10	3
47	15	7	10	3
48	16	8	12	4
49	16	8	12	4
50	16	8	12	4

Officers	Clerks	Supervisors	Secretaries	Directors
51	17	8	12	4
52	17	8	12	4
53	17	8	12	4
54	18	9	13	4
55	18	9	13	4
56	18	9	13	4
57	19	9	13	4
58	19	9	13	4
59	19	9	13	4
60	20	10	15	5
61	20	10	15	5
62	20	10	15	5
63	21	10	15	5
64	21	10	15	5
65	21	10	15	5
66	22	11	16	5
67	22	11	16	5
68	22	11	16	5
69	23	11	16	5
70	23	11	16	5
71	23	11	16	5
72	24	12	18	6
73	24	12	18	6
74	24	12	18	6
75	25	12	18	6
76	25	12	18	6
77	25	12	18	6

Officers	Clerks	Supervisors	Secretaries	Directors
78	26	13	19	6
79	26	13	19	6
80	26	13	19	6
81	27	13	19	6
82	27	13	19	6
83	27	13	19	6
84	28	14	21	7
85	28	14	21	7

APPENDIX D

PROBATION COST MODEL

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
1	10,000	25	21,104.00	1,950.00	19,154.00	766.16	2.10
1	20,000	50	21,104.00	3,900.00	17,204.00	344.08	0.94
1	30,000	75	21,104.00	5,850.00	15,254.00	203.39	0.56
2	30,000	37	25,246.00	5,772.00	29,474.00	398.30	1.09
2	40,000	50	35,246.00	7,800.00	27,446.00	274.46	0.75
2	50,000	62	35,246.00	9,671.99	25,574.01	206.24	0.57
3	50,000	41	49,388.00	9,594.00	39,794.00	323.53	0.89
3	60,000	50	49,388.00	11,700.00	37,688.00	251.25	0.69
3	70,000	58	49,388.00	13,571.99	35,816.01	205.84	0.56
4	70,000	43	63,530.00	13,416.00	50,114.00	291.36	0.80
4	80,000	50	63,530.00	15,600.00	47,930.00	239.65	0.66
4	90,000	56	63,530.00	17,471.98	46,058.02	205.62	0.56
5	90,000	45	77,672.00	17,550.00	60,122.00	267.21	0.73
5	100,000	50	77,672.00	19,500.00	58,172.00	232.69	0.64

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
5	110,000	55	77,672.00	21,449.98	56,222.02	204.44	0.56
6	110,000	45	123,100.00	21,060.00	102,040.00	377.93	1.04
6	120,000	50	123,100.00	23,400.00	99,700.00	332.33	0.91
6	130,000	54	123,100.00	25,271.98	97,828.00	301.94	0.83
7	130,000	46	137,242.00	25,116.00	112,126.00	348.22	0.95
7	140,000	50	137,242.00	27,300.00	109,942.00	314.12	0.86
7	150,000	53	137,242.00	28,937.97	108,304.00	291.92	0.80
8	150,000	46	151,384.00	28,704.00	122,680.00	333.37	0.91
8	160,000	50	151,384.00	31,200.00	120,184.00	300.46	0.82
8	170,000	53	151,384.00	33,071.97	118,312.00	279.04	0.76
9	170,000	47	172,488.00	32,994.00	139,494.00	329.77	0.90
9	180,000	50	172,488.00	35,100.00	137,388.00	305.31	0.84
9	190,000	52	172,488.00	36,504.00	135,984.00	290.56	0.80
10	190,000	47	186,630.00	36,660.00	149,970.00	319.08	0.87
10	200,000	50	186,630.00	39,000.00	147,630.00	295.26	0.81

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
10	210,000	52	186,630.00	40,560.00	146,070.00	280.90	0.77
11	210,000	47	200,772.00	40,326.00	160,446.00	310.34	0.85
11	220,000	50	200,772.00	42,900.00	157,872.00	287.04	0.79
11	230,000	52	200,772.00	44,616.00	156,156.00	273.00	0.75
12	230,000	47	272,824.00	43,992.00	228,832.00	405.73	1.11
12	240,000	50	272,824.00	46,800.00	226,024.00	376.71	1.03
12	250,000	52	272,824.00	48,672.00	224,152.00	359.22	0.98
13	250,000	48	286,966.00	48,672.00	238,294.00	381.88	1.05
13	260,000	50	286,966.00	50,700.00	236,266.00	363.49	1.00
13	270,000	51	286,966.00	51,714.00	235,252.00	354.83	0.97
14	270,000	48	301,108.00	52,416.00	248,692.00	370.08	1.01
14	280,000	50	301,108.00	54,600.00	246,508.00	352.15	0.96
14	290,000	51	301,108.00	55,692.00	245,416.00	343.72	0.94
15	290,000	48	322,212.00	56,160.00	266,052.00	369.52	1.01
15	300,000	50	322,212.00	58,500.00	263,712.00	351.62	0.96

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
15	310,000	51	322,212.00	59,670.00	262,542.00	343.19	0.94
16	310,000	48	336,354.00	59,904.00	276,450.00	359.96	0.99
16	320,000	50	336,354.00	62,400.00	273,954.00	342.44	0.94
16	330,000	51	336,354.00	63,648.00	272,706.00	334.20	0.92
17	330,000	48	350,496.00	63,647.99	286,848.00	351.53	0.96
17	340,000	50	350,496.00	66,299.94	284,196.06	334.35	0.92
17	350,000	51	350,496.00	67,625.94	282,870.06	326.26	0.89
18	350,000	48	395,924.00	67,391.94	328,532.06	380.25	1.04
18	360,000	50	395,924.00	70,199.94	325,724.06	361.92	0.99
18	370,000	51	395,924.00	71,603.94	324,320.06	353.29	0.97
19	370,000	48	410,066.00	71,135.94	338,930.06	371.63	1.02
19	380,000	50	410,066.00	74,099.94	335,966.06	353.65	0.97
19	390,000	51	410,066.00	75,581.94	334,484.06	345.18	0.95
20	390,000	48	424,208.00	74,879.94	349,328.06	363.88	1.00
20	400,000	50	424,208.00	77,999.94	346,208.06	346.21	0.95

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
20	410,000	51	424,208.00	79,559.94	344,648.06	337.89	0.93
21	410,000	48	445,312.00	78,623.94	366,688.06	363.78	1.00
21	420,000	50	445,312.00	81,899.94	363,412.06	346.11	0.95
21	430,000	51	445,312.00	83,537.94	361,774.06	337.79	0.93
22	430,000	48	459,454.00	82,367.94	377,086.06	357.09	0.98
22	440,000	50	459,454.00	85,799.94	373,654.06	339.69	0.93
22	450,000	51	459,454.00	87,515.94	371,938.06	331.50	0.91
23	450,000	48	473,596.00	86,111.94	387,484.06	350.98	0.96
23	460,000	50	473,596.00	89,699.94	383,896.06	333.82	0.91
23	470,000	51	473,596.00	91,493.94	382,102.06	325.75	0.89
24	470,000	48	545,648.00	89,855.94	455,792.06	395.65	1.08
24	480,000	50	545,648.00	93,599.94	452,048.06	376.71	1.03
24	490,000	51	545,648.00	95,471.94	450,176.06	367.79	1.01
25	490,000	49	559,790.00	95,549.94	464,240.06	378.97	1.04
25	500,000	50	559,790.00	97,499.94	462,290.06	369.83	1.01

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
25	510,000	51	559,790.00	99,449.94	460,340.06	361.05	0.99
26	510,000	49	573,932.00	99,371.94	474,560.06	372.50	1.02
26	520,000	50	573,932.00	101,399.94	472,532.06	363.49	1.00
26	530,000	50	573,932.00	101,399.94	472,532.06	363.49	1.00
27	530,000	49	595,036.00	103,193.94	491,842.06	371.76	1.02
27	540,000	50	595,036.00	105,299.94	489,736.06	362.77	0.99
27	550,000	50	595,036.00	105,299.94	489,736.06	362.77	0.99
28	550,000	49	609,178.00	107,015.94	502,162.06	366.01	1.00
28	560,000	50	609,178.00	109,199.94	499,978.06	357.13	0.98
28	570,000	50	609,178.00	109,199.94	499,978.06	357.13	0.98
29	570,000	49	623,320.00	110,837.94	512,482.06	360.65	0.99
29	580,000	50	623,320.00	113,099.94	510,220.06	351.88	0.96
29	590,000	50	623,320.00	113,099.94	510,220.06	351.88	0.96
30	590,000	49	668,748.00	114,659.94	554,088.06	376.93	1.03
30	600,000	50	668,748.00	116,999.94	551,748.06	367.83	1.01

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
30	610,000	50	668,748.00	116,999.94	551,748.06	367.83	1.01
31	610,000	49	682,890.00	118,481.94	564,408.06	371.57	1.02
31	620,000	50	682,890.00	120,899.94	561,990.06	362.57	0.99
31	630,000	50	682,890.00	120,899.94	561,990.06	362.57	0.99
32	630,000	49	697,032.00	122,303.94	574,728.06	366.54	1.00
32	640,000	50	697,032.00	124,799.94	572,232.06	357.65	0.98
32	650,000	50	697,032.00	124,799.94	572,232.06	357.65	0.98
33	650,000	49	718,136.00	126,125.94	592,010.06	366.12	1.00
33	660,000	50	718,136.00	128,699.94	589,436.06	357.23	0.98
33	670,000	50	718,136.00	128,699.94	589,436.06	357.23	0.98
34	670,000	49	732,278.00	129,947.94	602,330.06	361.54	0.99
34	680,000	50	732,278.00	132,599.94	599,678.06	352.75	0.97
34	690,000	50	732,278.00	132,599.94	599,678.06	352.75	0.97
35	690,000	49	746,420.00	133,769.94	612,650.06	357.23	0.98
35	700,000	50	746,420.00	136,499.94	609,920.06	348.53	0.95

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
35	710,000	50	746,420.00	136,499.94	609,920.06	348.53	0.95
36	710,000	49	818,472.00	137,591.94	680,880.06	385.99	1.06
36	720,000	50	818,472.00	140,399.94	678,072.06	376.71	1.03
36	730,000	50	818,472.00	140,399.94	678,072.06	376.71	1.03
37	730,000	49	832,614.00	141,413.94	691,200.06	381.25	1.04
37	740,000	50	832,614.00	144,299.94	688,314.06	372.06	1.02
37	750,000	50	832,614.00	144,299.94	688,314.06	372.06	1.02
38	750,000	49	846,756.00	145,235.94	701,520.06	376.76	1.03
38	760,000	50	846,756.00	148,199.94	698,556.06	367.66	1.01
38	770,000	50	846,756.00	148,199.94	698,556.06	367.66	1.01
39	770,000	49	867,860.00	149,057.94	718,802.06	376.14	1.03
39	780,000	50	867,860.00	152,099.94	715,760.06	367.06	1.01
39	790,000	50	867,860.00	152.099.94	715,760.06	367.06	1.01
40	790,000	49	882,002.00	152,879.94	729,122.06	372.00	1.02
40	800,000	50	882,002.00	155,999.94	726,002.06	363.00	0.99

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
40	810,000	50	882,002.00	155,999.94	726,002.06	363.00	0.99
41	810,000	49	896,144.00	156,701.94	739,442.06	368.06	1.01
41	820,000	50	896,144.00	159,899.94	736,244.06	359.14	0.98
41	830,000	50	896,144.00	159,899.94	736,244.06	359.14	0.98
42	830,000	49	941,572.00	160,523.94	781,048.06	379.52	1.04
42	840,000	50	941,572.00	163,799.94	777,772.06	370.37	1.01
42	850,000	50	941,572.00	163,799.94	777,772.06	370.37	1.01
43	850,000	49	955,714.00	164,345.94	791,368.06	375.59	1.03
43	860,000	50	955,714.00	167,699.94	788,014.06	366.52	1.00
43	870,000	50	955,714.00	167,699.94	788,014.06	366.52	1.00
44	870,000	49	969,856.00	168,167.94	801,688.06	371.84	1.02
44	880,000	50	969,856.00	171,599.94	798,256.06	362.84	0.99
44	890,000	50	969,856.00	171,599.94	798,256.06	362.84	0.99
45	890,000	49	990,960.00	171,989.94	818,970.06	371.41	1.02
45	900,000	50	990,960.00	175,499.94	815,460.06	362.43	0.99

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
45	910,000	50	990,960.00	175,499.94	815,460.06	362.43	0.99
46	910,000	49	1,005,102.00	175,811.94	829,290.06	367.92	1.01
46	920,000	50	1,005,102.00	179,399.94	825,702.06	359.00	0.98
46	930,000	50	1,005,102.00	179,399.94	825,702.06	359.00	0.98
47	930,000	49	1,019,244.00	179,633.94	839,610.06	364.57	1.00
47	940,000	50	1,019,244.00	183,299.94	835,944.06	355.72	0.97
47	950,000	50	1,019,244.00	183,299.94	835,944.06	355.72	0.97
48	950,000	49	1,091,296.00	183,455.94	907,840.06	385.99	1.06
48	960,000	50	1,091,296.00	187,199.94	904,096.06	376.71	1.03
48	970,000	50	1,091,296.00	187,199.94	904,096.06	376.71	1.03
49	970,000	49	1,105,438.00	187,277.94	918,160.06	382.41	1.05
49	980,000	50	1,105,438.00	191,099.94	914,338.06	373.20	1.02
49	990,000	50	1,105,438.00	191,099.94	914,338.06	373.20	1.02
50	990,000	49	1,119,580.00	191,099.94	928,480.06	378.97	1.04
50	1,000,000	50	1,119,580.00	194,999.94	924,580.06	369.83	1.01

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
50	1,010,000	50	1,119,580.00	194,999.94	924,580.06	369.83	1.01
51	1,010,000	49	1,140,684.00	194,921.94	945,762.06	378.46	1.04
51	1,020,000	50	1,140,684.00	198,899.94	941,784.06	369.33	1.01
51	1,030,000	50	1,140,684.00	198,899.94	941,784.06	369.33	1.01
52	1,030,000	49	1,154,826.00	198,743.94	156,082.06	375.23	1.03
52	1,040,000	50	1,154,826.00	202,799.94	952,026.06	366.16	1.00
52	1,050,000	50	1,154,826.00	202,799.94	952,026.06	366.16	1.00
53	1,050,000	49	1,168,968.00	202,565.94	966,402.06	372.12	1.02
53	1,060,000	50	1,168,968.00	206,699.94	962,268.06	363.12	0.99
53	1,070,000	50	1,168,968.00	206,699 94	962,268.06	363.12	0.99
54	1,070,000	49	1,214,396.00	206,387.94	1,008,008.06	380.96	1.04
54	1,080,000	50	1,214,396.00	210,599.94	1,003,796.06	371.78	1.02
54	1,090,000	50	1,214,396.00	210,599.94	1,003,796.06	371.78	1.02
55	1,090,000	49	1,228,533.00	210,209.94	1,018,328.06	377.86	1.04
55	1,100,000	50	1,228,538.00	214,499.94	1,014,038.06	368.74	1.01

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
55	1,110,000	50	1,228,538.00	214,499.94	1,014,038.06	368.74	1.01
56	1,110,000	49	1,242,680.00	214,031.94	1,028,648.06	374.87	1.03
56	1,120,000	50	1,242,680.00	218,399.94	1,024,280.06	365.81	1.00
56	1,130,000	50	1,242,680.00	218,399.94	1,024,280.06	365.81	1.00
57	1,130,000	49	1,263,784.00	217,853.94	1,045,930.06	374.48	1.03
57	1,140,000	50	1,263,784.00	222,299.94	1,041,484.06	365.43	1.00
57	1,150,000	50	1,263,784.00	222,299.94	1,041,484.06	365.43	1.00
58	1,150,000	49	1,277,926.00	221,675.94	1,056,250.00	371.66	1.02
58	1,160,000	50	1,277,926.00	226,199.94	1,051,726.00	362.66	0.99
58	1,170,000	50	1,277,926.00	226,199.94	1,051,726.00	362.66	0.99
59	1,170,000	49	1,292,068.00	225,497.94	1,066,570.00	368.93	1.01
59	1,180,000	50	1,292,068.00	230,099.94	1,061,968.00	359.99	0.99
59	1,190,000	50	1,292,068.00	230,099.94	1,061,968.00	359.99	0.99
60	1,190,000	49	1,364,120.00	229,319.94	1,134,800.00	385.99	1.06
60	1,200,000	50	1,364,120.00	233,999.94	1,130,120.00	376.71	1.03

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
60	1,210,000	50	1,364,120.00	233,999.94	1,130,120.00	376.71	1.03
61	1,210,000	49	1,378,262.00	233,141.94	1,145,120.00	383.11	1.05
61	1,220,000	50	1,378,262.00	237,899.94	1,140,362.00	373.89	1.02
61	1,230,000	50	1,378,262.00	237,899.94	1,140,362.00	373.89	1.02
62	1,230,000	49	1,392,404.00	236,963.94	1,155,440.00	380.33	1.04
62	1,240,000	50	1,392,404.00	241,799.94	1,150,604.00	371.16	1.02
62	1,250,000	50	1,392,404.00	241,799.94	1,150,604.00	371.16	1.02
63	1,250,000	49	1,413,508.00	240,785.94	1,172,722.00	379.89	1.04
63	1,260,000	50	1,413,508.00	245,699.94	1,167,808.00	370.73	1.02
63	1,270,000	50	1,413,508.00	245,699.94	1,167,808.00	370.73	1.02
64	1,270,000	49	1,427,650.00	244,607.94	1,183,042.00	377.25	1.03
64	1,280,000	50	1,427,650.00	249,599.94	1,178,050.00	368.14	1.01
64	1,290,000	50	1,427,650.00	249,599.94	1,178,050.00	368.14	1.01
65	1,290,000	49	1,441,792.00	248,429.94	1,193,362.00	374.68	1.03
65	1,300,000	50	1,441,792.00	253,499.94	1,188,292.00	365.63	1.00

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
65	1,310,000	50	1,441,792.00	253,499.94	1,188,292.00	365.63	1.00
66	1,310,000	49	1,487,220.00	252,251.94	1,234,968.00	381.87	1.05
66	1,320,000	50	1,487,220.00	257,399.94	1,229,820.00	372.67	1.02
66	1,330,000	50	1,487,220.00	257,399.94	1,229,820.00	372.67	1.02
67	1,330,000	49	1,501,362.00	256,073.94	1,245,288.00	379.31	1.04
67	1,340,000	50	1,501,362.00	261,299.94	1,240,062.00	370.17	1.01
67	1,350,000	50	1,501,362.00	261,299.94	1,240,062.00	370.17	1.01
68	1,350,000	49	1,515,504.00	259,895.94	1,255,608.00	376.83	1.03
68	1,360,000	50	1,515,504.00	265,199.94	1,250,304.00	367.74	1.01
68	1,370,000	50	1,515,504.00	265,199.94	1,250,304.00	367.74	1.01
69	1,370,000	49	1,536,608.00	263,717.94	1,272,890.00	376.48	1.03
69	1,380,000	50	1,536,608.00	269,099.94	1,267,508.00	367.39	1.01
69	1,390,000	50	1,536,608.00	569,099.94	1,267,508.00	367.39	1.01
70	1,390,000	49	1,550,750.00	267,539.94	1,283,210.00	374.11	1.02
70	1,400,000	50	1,550,750.00	272,999.94	1,277,750.00	365.07	1.00

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
70	1,410,000	50	1,550,750.00	272,999.94	1,277,750.00	365.07	1.00
71	1,410,000	49	1,564,892.00	271,361.94	1,293,530.00	371.81	1.02
71	1,420,000	50	1,564,892.00	276,899.94	1,287,992.00	362.81	0.99
71	1,430,000	50	1,564,892.00	276,899.94	1,287,992.00	362.81	0.99
72	1,430,000	49	1,636,944.00	275,183.94	1,361,760.00	385.99	1.06
72	1,440,000	50	1,636,944.00	280,799.94	1,356,144.00	376.71	1.03
72	1,450,000	50	1,636,944.00	280,799.94	1,356,144.00	376.71	1.03
73	1,450,000	49	1,651,086.00	279,005.94	1,372,080.00	383.58	1.05
73	1,460,000	50	1,651,086.00	284,699.94	1,366,386.00	374.35	1.03
73	1,470,000	50	1,651,086.00	284,699.94	1,366,386.00	374.35	1.03
74	1,470,000	49	1,665,228.00	282,827.94	1,382,400.00	381.25	1.04
74	1,480,000	50	1,665,228.00	288,599.94	1,376,628.00	372.06	1.02
74	1,490,000	50	1,665,228.00	288,599.94	1,376,628.00	372.06	1.02
75	1,490,000	49	1,686,332.00	286,649.94	1,399,682.00	380.87	1.04
75	1,500,000	50	1,686,332.00	292,499.94	1,393,832.00	371.69	1.02

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
75	1,510,000	50	1,686,332.00	292,400.94	1,393,832.00	371.69	1.02
76	1,510,000	49	1,700,474.00	290,471.94	1,410,002.00	378.63	1.04
76	1,520,000	50	1,700,474.00	296,399.94	1,404,074.00	369.49	1.01
76	1,530,000	50	1,700,474.00	296,399.94	1,404,074.00	369.49	1.01
77	1,530,000	49	1,714,616.00	294,293.94	1,420,322.00	376.44	1.03
77	1,540,000	50	1,714,616.00	300,299.94	1,414,316.00	367.35	1.01
77	1,550,000	50	1,714,616.00	300,299.94	1,414,316.00	367.35	1.01
78	1,550,000	49	1,760,044.00	298,115.94	1,461,928.00	382.50	1.05
78	1,560,000	50	1,760,044.00	304,199.94	1,455,844.00	373.29	1.02
78	1,570,000	50	1,760,044.00	304,199.94	1,455,844.00	373.29	1.02
79	1,570,000	49	1,774,186.00	301,937.94	1,472,248.00	380.33	1.04
79	1,580,000	50	1,774,186.00	308,099.94	1,466,086.00	371.16	1.02
79	1,590,000	50	1,774,186.00	308,099.94	1,466,086.00	371.16	1.02
80	1,590,000	49	1,788,328.00	305,759.94	1,482,568.00	378.21	1.04
80	1,600,000	50	1,788,328.00	311,999.94	1,476,328.00	369.08	1.01

APPENDIX D - PROBATION COST MODEL - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
80	1,610,000	50	1,788,328.00	311,999.94	1,476,328.00	369.08	1.01
81	1,610,000	49	1,809,432.00	309,581.94	1,499,850.00	377.89	1.04
81	1,620,000	50	1,809,432.00	315,899.94	1,493,532.00	368.77	1.01
81	1,630,000	50	1,809,432.00	315,899.94	1,493,532.00	368.77	1.01
82	1,630,000	49	1,823,574.00	313,403.94	1,510,170.00	375.85	1.03
82	1,640,000	50	1,823,574.00	319,799.94	1,503,774.00	366.77	1.00
82	1,650,000	50	1,823,574.00	319,799.94	1,503,774.00	366.77	1.00
83	1,650,000	49	1,837,716.00	317,225.94	1,520,490.00	373.86	1.02
83	1,660,000	50	1,837,716.00	323,699.94	1,514,016.00	364.82	1.00
83	1,670,000	50	1,837,716.00	323,699.94	1,514,016.00	364.82	1.00
84	1,670,000	49	1,909,768.00	321,047.94	1,588,720.00	385.99	1.06
84	1,680,000	50	1,909,768.00	327,599.94	1,582,168.00	376.71	1.03
84	1,690,000	50	1,909,768.00	327,599.94	1,582,168.00	376.71	1.03
85	1,690,000	49	1,923,910.00	324,869.94	1,599,040.00	383.92	1.05
85	1,700,000	50	1,923,910.00	331,499.94	1,592,410.00	374.68	1.03
85	1,710,000	50	1,923,910.00	331,499.94	1,592,410.00	374.68	1.03

APPENDIX E

PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
1	10,000	25	19,280.00	1,950.00	17,330.00	693.20	1.90
1	20,000	50	19,280.00	3,900.00	15,380.00	307.60	0.84
1	30,000	75	19,280.00	5,850.00	13,430.00	179.07	0.49
2	30,000	37	32,510.00	5,772.00	26,738.00	361.32	0.99
2	40,000	50	32,510.00	7,800.00	24,710.00	247.10	0.68
2	50,000	62	32,510.00	9,671.99	22,838.01	184.18	0.50
3	50,000	41	45,740.00	9,594.00	36,146.00	293.87	0.81
3	60,000	50	45,740.00	11,700.00	34,040.00	226.93	0.62
3	70,000	58	45,740.00	13,571.99	32,168.01	184.87	0.51
4	70,000	43	58,970.00	13,416.00	45,554.00	264.85	0.73
4	80,000	50	58,970.00	15,600.00	43,370.00	216.85	0.59
4	90,000	56	58,970.00	17,471.98	41,498.02	185.26	0.51
5	90,000	45	72,200.00	17,550.00	54,650.00	242.89	0.67
5	100,000	50	72,200.00	19,500.00	52,700.00	210.80	0.58

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST-Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
5	110,000	55	72,200.00	21,449.98	50,750.02	184.55	0.51
6	110,000	45	113,980.00	21,060.00	92,920.00	344.15	0.94
6	120,000	50	113,980.00	23,400.00	90,580.00	301.93	0.83
6	130,000	54	113,980.00	25,271.98	88,708.00	263.79	0.75
7	130,000	46	127,210.00	25,116.00	102,094.00	317.06	0.87
7	140,000	50	127,210.00	27,300.00	99,910.00	285.46	0.78
7	150,000	53	127,210.00	28,937.94	98,272.00	264.88	0.73
8	150,000	46	140,440.00	28,704.00	111,736.00	303.63	0.83
8	160,000	50	140,440.00	31,200.00	109,240.00	273.10	0.75
8	170,000	53	140,440.00	33,071.97	107,368.00	253.23	0.69
9	170,000	47	159,720.00	32,994.00	126,726.00	299.59	0.82
9	180,000	50	159,720.00	35,100.00	124,620.00	276.93	0.76
9	190,000	52	159,720.00	36,504.00	123,216.00	263.28	0.72
10	190,000	47	172,950.00	36,660.00	136,290.00	289.98	0.79
10	200,000	50	172,950.00	39,000.00	133,950.00	267.90	0.73

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
10	210,000	52	172,950.00	40,560.00	132,390.00	254.60	0.70
11	210,000	47	186,180.00	40,326.00	145,854.00	282.12	0.77
11	220,000	50	186,180.00	42,900.00	143,280.00	260.51	0.71
11	230,000	52	186,180.00	44,616.00	141,564.00	247.49	0.68
12	230,000	47	252,760.00	43,992.00	208,768.00	370.16	1.01
12	240,000	50	252,760.00	46,800.00	205,960.00	343.27	0.94
12	250,000	52	252,760.00	48,672.00	204,088.00	327.06	0.90
13	250,000	48	265,990.00	48,672.00	217,318.00	348.27	0.95
13	260,000	50	265,990.00	50,700.00	215,290.00	331.22	0.91
13	270,000	51	265,990.00	51,714.00	214,276.00	323.19	0.89
14	270,000	48	279,220.00	52,416.00	226,804.00	337.51	0.92
14	280,000	50	279,220.00	54,600.00	224,620.00	320.89	0.88
14	290,000	51	279,220.00	55,692.00	223,528.00	313.06	0.86
15	290,000	48	298,500.00	56,160.00	242,340.00	336.58	0.92
15	300,000	50	298,500.00	58,500.00	240,000.00	320.00	0.88

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
15	310,000	51	298,500.00	59,670.00	238,830.00	312.20	0.86
16	310,000	48	311,730.00	59,904.00	251,826.00	327.90	0.90
16	320,000	50	311,730.00	52,400.00	249,330.00	311.66	0.85
16	330,000	51	311,730.00	63,648.00	248,082.00	304.02	0.83
17	330,000	48	324,960.00	63,647.00	261,312.00	320.24	0.83
17	340,000	50	324,960.00	66,299.94	258,660.06	304.31	0.83
17	350,000	51	324,960.00	67,625.94	257,334.06	296.81	0.81
18	350,000	48	366,740.00	67,391.94	299,348.06	346.47	0.95
18	360,000	50	366,740.00	70,199.94	296,540.06	329.49	0.90
18	370,000	51	366,740.00	71,603.94	295,136.06	321.50	0.88
19	370,000	48	379,970.00	71,135.94	308,834.06	338.63	0.93
19	380,000	50	379,970.00	74,099.94	305,870.06	321.97	0.88
19	390,000	51	379,970.00	75,581.94	304,388.06	314.13	0.86
20	390,000	48	393,200.00	74,879.94	318,320.06	331.58	0.91
20	400,000	50	393,200.00	77,999.94	315,200.06	315.20	0.86

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
20	410,000	51	393,200.00	79,559.94	313,640.06	307.49	0.84
21	410,000	48	412,480.00	78,623.94	333,856.06	331.21	0.91
21	420,000	50	412,480.00	81,899.94	330,580.06	314.84	0.86
21	430,000	51	412,480.00	83,537.94	328,942.06	307.14	0.84
22	430,000	48	425,710.00	82,367.94	343,342.06	325.13	0.89
22	440,000	50	425,710.00	85,799.94	339,910.06	309.01	0.85
22	450,000	51	425,710.00	87,515.94	338,194.06	301.42	0.83
23	450,000	48	438,940.00	86,111.94	352,828.06	319.59	0.88
23	460,000	50	438,940.00	89,699.94	349,240.06	303.69	0.83
23	470,000	51	438,940.00	91,493.94	347,446.06	296.20	0.81
24	470,000	48	505,520.00	89,855.94	415,664.06	360.82	0.99
24	480,000	50	505,520.00	93,599.94	411,920.06	343.27	0.94
24	490,000	51	505,520.00	95,471.94	410,048.06	335.01	0.92
25	490,000	49	518,750.00	95,549.94	423,200.06	345.47	0.95
25	500,000	50	518,750.00	97,499.94	421,250.06	337.00	0.92

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
25	510,000	51	518,750.00	99,449.94	419,300.06	328,86	0.90
26	510,000	49	531,980.00	99,371.94	432,608.06	339.57	0.93
26	520,000	50	531,980.00	101,399.94	430,580.06	331.22	0.91
26	530,000	50	531,980.00	101,399.94	430,580.06	331.22	0.91
27	530,000	49	551,260.00	103,193.94	448,066.06	338.67	0.93
27	540,000	50	551,260.00	105,299.94	445,960.06	330.34	0.91
27	550,000	50	551,260.00	105,299.94	445,960.06	330.34	0.91
28	550,000	49	564,490.00	107,015.94	457,474.06	333.44	0.91
28	560,000	50	564,490.00	109,199.94	455,290.06	325.21	0.89
28	570,000	50	564,490.00	109,199.94	455,290.06	325.21	0.89
29	570,000	49	577,720.00	110,837.94	466,882.06	328.56	0.90
29	580,000	50	577,720.00	113,099.94	464,620.06	320.43	0.88
29	590,000	50	577,720.00	113,099.94	464,620.06	320.43	0.88
30	590,000	49	619,500.00	114,659.94	504,840.06	343.43	0.94
30	600,000	50	619,500.00	116,999.94	502,500.06	335.00	0.92

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
30	610,000	50	619,500.00	116,999.94	502,500.06	335.00	0.92
31	610,000	49	632,730.00	118,481.94	514,248.06	338.54	0.93
31	620,000	50	532,730.00	120,899.94	511,830.06	330.21	0.90
31	630,000	50	632,730.00	120,899.94	511,830.06	330.21	0.90
32	630,000	49	645,960.00	122,303.94	523,656.06	333.96	0.91
32	640,000	50	546,960.00	124,799.94	521,160.06	325.72	0.89
32	650,000	50	645,960.00	124,799.94	521,160.06	325.72	0.89
33	650,000	49	665,240.00	126,125.94	539,114.06	333.40	0.91
33	660,000	50	665,240.00	128,699.94	536,540.06	325.18	0.89
33	670,000	50	665,240.00	128,699.94	536,540.06	325.18	0.89
34	670,000	49	678,470.00	129,947.94	548,522.06	329.24	0.90
34	680,000	50	678,470.00	132,599.94	545,870.06	321.10	0.88
34	690,000	50	678,470.00	132,599.94	545,870.06	321.10	0.88
35	690,000	49	691,700.00	133,769.94	557,930.06	325.32	0.89
35	700,000	50	691,700.00	136,499.94	555,200.06	317.26	0.87

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
35	710,000	50	691,700.00	136,499.94	555,200.06	317.26	0.87
36	710,000	49	758,280.00	137,591.94	620,688.06	351.86	0.96
36	720,000	50	758,280.00	140,399.94	617,880.06	343.27	0.94
36	730,000	50	758,280.00	140,399.94	617,880.06	343.27	0.94
37	730,000	49	771,510.00	141,413.94	630,096.06	347.54	0.95
37	740,000	50	771,510.00	144,299.94	627,210.06	339.03	0.93
37	750,000	50	771,510.00	144,299.94	627,210.06	339.03	0.93
38	750,000	49	784,740.00	145,235.94	639,504.06	343.45	0.94
38	760,000	50	784,740.00	148,199.94	636,540.06	335.02	0.92
38	770,000	50	784,740.00	148,199.94	636,540.06	335.02	0.92
39	770,000	49	804,020.00	149,057.04	654,962.06	342.73	0.94
39	780,00	50	804,020.00	152,099.94	651,920.06	334.32	0.92
39	790,000	50	804,020.00	152,099.94	651,920.06	334.32	0.92
40	790,000	49	817,250.00	152,879.94	664,370.06	338.96	0.93
40	800,000	50	817,250.00	155,999.94	661,250.06	330.63	0.91

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
40	810,000	50	817,250.00	155,999.94	661,250.06	330.63	0.91
41	810,000	49	830,480.00	156,701.94	673,778.06	335.38	0.92
41	820,000	50	830,480.00	159,899.94	670,580.06	327.11	0.90
41	830,000	50	830,480.00	159,899.94	670,580.06	327.11	0.90
42	830,000	49	872,260.00	160,523.94	711,736.06	345.84	0.95
42	840,000	50	872,260.00	163,799.94	708,460.06	337.36	0.92
42	850,000	50	872,260.00	163,799.94	708,460.06	337.36	0.92
43	850,000	49	885,490.00	164,345.94	721,144.06	342.26	0.94
43	860,000	50	885,490.00	167,699.94	717,790.06	333.86	0.91
43	870,000	50	885,490.00	167,699.94	717,790.06	333.86	0.91
44	870,000	49	898,720.00	168,167.94	730,552.06	338.85	0.93
44	880,000	50	898,720.00	171,599.94	727,120.06	330.51	0.91
44	890,000	50	898,720.00	171,599.94	727,120.06	330.50	0.91
45	890,000	49	918,000.00	171,989.94	746,010.06	338.33	0.93
45	900,000	50	918,000.00	175,499.94	742,500.06	330.00	0.90

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
45	910,000	50	918,000.00	175,499.94	742,500.06	330.00	0.90
46	910,000	49	931,230.00	175,811.94	755,418.06	335.15	0.92
46	920,000	50	931,230.00	179,399.94	751,830.06	326.88	0.90
46	930,000	50	931,230.00	179,399.94	751,830.06	326.88	0.90
47	930,000	49	944,460.00	179,633.04	764,836.06	332.10	0.91
47	940,000	50	944,460.00	183,299.94	761,160.06	323.90	0.89
47	950,000	50	944,460.00	183.299.94	761,160.06	323.90	0.89
48	950,000	49	1,011,040.00	183,455.94	827,584.06	351.86	0.96
48	960,000	50	1,011,040.00	187,199.94	823,840.06	343.27	0.94
48	970,000	50	1,011,040.00	187,199.94	823,840.06	343.27	0.94
49	970,000	49	1,024,270.00	187,277.94	836,992.06	348.60	0.96
49	980,000	50	1,024,270.00	191,099.94	833,170.06	340.07	0.93
49	990,000	50	1,024,270.00	191,099.94	833,170.06	340.07	0.93
50	990,000	49	1,037,500.00	191,099.94	846,400.06	345.47	0.95
50	1,000,000	50	1,037,500.00	194,999.94	842,500.06	337.00	0.92

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
50	1,010,000	50	1,037,500.00	194,999.94	842,500.06	337.00	0.92
51	1,010,000	49	1,056,780.00	194,921.94	861,858.06	344.88	0.94
51	1,020,000	50	1,056,780.00	198,899.94	857,880.06	336.42	0.92
51	1,030,000	50	1,056,780.00	198,899.94	857,880.06	336.42	0.92
52	1,030,000	49	1,070,010.00	198,743.94	871,266.06	341.94	0.94
52	1,040,000	50	1,070,010.00	202,799.94	867,210.06	333.54	0.91
52	1,050,000	50	1,070,010.00	202,799.94	867,210.06	333.54	0.91
53	1,050,000	49	1,083,240.00	202,565.94	880,674.06	339.11	0.93
53	1,060,000	50	1,083,240.00	206,699.94	876,540.06	330.77	0.91
53	1,070,000	50	1,083,240.00	206,699.94	876,540.06	330.77	0.91
54	1,070,000	49	1,125,020.00	206,387.94	918,632.06	347.18	0.95
54	1,080,000	50	1,125,020.00	210,599.94	914,420.06	338.67	0.93
54	1,090,000	50	1,125,020.00	210,599.94	914,420.06	338.67	0.93
55	1,090,000	49	1,138,250.00	210,209.94	928,040.06	344.36	0.94
55	1,100,000	50	1,138,250.00	214,499.94	923,750.06	335.91	0.92

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
55	1,110,000	50	1,138,250.00	214,499.94	923,750.06	335.91	0.92
56	1,110,000	49	1,151,480.00	214,031.94	937,448.06	341.64	0.94
56	1,120,000	50	1,151,480.00	218,399.94	933,080.06	333.24	0.91
56	1,130,000	50	1,151,480.00	218,399.94	933,080.06	333.24	0.91
57	1,130,000	49	1,170,760.00	217,853.94	952,906.06	341.18	0.93
57	1,140,000	50	1,170,760.00	222,299.94	948,460.06	332.79	0.91
57	1,150,000	50	1,170,760.00	222,299.94	948,460.06	332.79	0.91
58	1,150,000	49	1,183,990.00	221,675.94	962,314.06	338.60	0.93
58	1,160,000	50	1,183,990.00	226,199.94	957,790.06	330.27	0.90
58	1,170,000	50	1,183,990.00	226,199.94	957,790.06	330.27	0.90
59	1,170,000	49	1,197,220.00	225,497.94	971,722.06	336.12	0.92
59	1,180,000	50	1,197,220.99	230,099.94	967,120.06	327.84	0.90
59	1,190,000	50	1,197,220.00	230,099.94	967,120.06	327.84	0.90
60	1,190,000	49	1,263,800.00	229,319.94	1,034,480.06	351.86	0.96
60	1,200,000	50	1,263,800.00	233,999.94	1,029,800.06	343.27	0.94

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
60	1,210,000	50	1,263,800.00	233,999.94	1,029,800.06	343.27	0.94
61	1,210,000	49	1,277,030.00	233,141.94	1,043,888.06	349.24	0.96
61	1,220,000	50	1,277,030.00	237,899.94	1,039,130.06	340.70	0.93
61	1,230,000	50	1,277,030.00	237,899.94	1,039,130.06	340.70	0.93
62	1,230,000	49	1,290,260.00	236,963.94	1,053,296.00	346.71	0.95
62	1,240,000	50	1,290,260.00	241,799.94	1,048,460.06	338.21	0.93
62	1,250,000	50	1,290,260.00	241,799.94	1,048,460.06	338.21	0.93
63	1,250,000	49	1,309,540.00	240,785.94	1,068,754.00	346.21	0.95
63	1,260,000	50	1,309,540.00	245,699.94	1,063,840.00	337.73	0.93
63	1,270,000	50	1,309,540.00	245,699.94	1,063,840.00	337.73	0.93
64	1,270,000	49	1,322,770.00	244,607.94	1,078,162.00	343.80	0.94
64	1,280,000	50	1,322,770.00	249,599.94	1,073,170.00	335.37	0.92
64	1,290,000	50	1,322,770.00	249,599.94	1,073,170.00	335.37	0.92
65	1,290,000	49	1,336,000.00	248,429.94	1,087,570.00	341.47	0.94
65	1,300,000	50	1,336,000.00	253,499.94	1,082,500.00	333.08	0.91

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
65	1,310,000	50	1,336,000.00	253,499.94	1,082,500.00	333.08	0.91
66	1,310,000	49	1,377,780.00	252,251.94	1,125,528.00	348.03	0.95
66	1,320,000	50	1,377,780.00	257,399.94	1,120,380.00	339.51	0.93
66	1,330,000	50	1,377,780.00	257,399.94	1,120,380.00	339.51	0.93
67	1,330,000	49	1,391,010.00	256,073.94	1,134,936.00	345.70	0.95
67	1,340,000	50	1,391,010.00	261,299.94	1,129,710.00	337.23	0.92
67	1,350,000	50	1,391,010.00	261,299.94	1,129,710.00	337.23	0.92
68	1,350,000	49	1,404,240.00	259,895.94	1,144,344.00	343.44	0.94
68	1,360,000	50	1,404,240.00	265,199.94	1,139,040.00	335.01	0.92
68	1,370,000	50	1,404,240.00	265,199.94	1,139,040.00	335.01	0.92
69	1,370,000	49	1,423,520.00	263,717.94	1,159,802.00	343.04	0.94
69	1,380,000	50	1,423,520.00	269,099.94	1,154,420.00	334.61	0.92
69	1,390,000	50	1,423,520.00	269,099.94	1,154,420.00	334.61	0.92
70	1,390,000	49	1,436,750.00	267,539.94	1,169,210.00	340.88	0.93
70	1,400,000	50	1,436,750.00	272,999.94	1,163,750.00	332.50	0.91

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
70	1,410,000	50	1,436,750.00	272,999.94	1,163,750.00	332.50	0.91
71	1,410,000	49	1,449,980.00	271,361.94	1,178,618.00	338.78	0.93
71	1,420,000	50	1,449,980.00	276,899.94	1,173,080.00	330.45	0.91
71	1,430,000	50	1,449,980.00	276,899.94	1,173,080.00	330.45	0.91
72	1,430,000	49	1,516,560.00	275,183.94	1,241,376.00	351,86	0.96
72	1,440,000	50	1,516,560.00	280,799.94	1,235,760.00	343.27	0.94
72	1,450,000	50	1,516,560.00	280,799.94	1,235,760.00	343.27	0.94
73	1,450,000	49	1,529,790.00	279,005.94	1,250,784.00	349.67	0.96
73	1,460,000	50	1,529,790.00	284,699.94	1,245,090.00	341.12	0.93
73	1,470,000	50	1,529,790.00	284,699.94	1,245,090.00	341.12	0.93
74	1,470,000	49	1,543,020.00	282,827.94	1,260,192.00	347.54	0.95
74	1,480,000	50	1,543,020.00	288,599.94	1,254,420.00	339.03	0.93
74	1,490,000	50	1,543,020.00	288,599.94	1,254,420.00	339.03	0.93
75	1,490,000	49	1,562,300.00	286,649.94	1,275,650.00	347.12	0.95
75	1,500,000	50	1,562,300.00	292,499.94	1,269,800.00	338.61	0.93

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
75	1,510,000	50	1,562,300.00	292,499.94	1,269,800.00	338.61	0.93
76	1,510,000	49	1,575,530.00	290,471.94	1,285,058.00	345.07	0.95
76	1,520,000	50	1,575,530.00	296,399.94	1,279,130.00	336.61	0.92
76	1,530,000	50	1,575,530.00	296,399.94	1,279,130.00	336.61	0.92
77	1,530,000	49	1,588,760.00	294,293.94	1,294,466.00	343.09	0.94
77	1,540,000	50	1,588,760.00	300,299.94	1,288,460.00	334.66	0.92
77	1,550,000	50	1,588,760.00	300,299.94	1,288,460.00	334.66	0.92
78	1,550,000	49	1,630,540.00	298,115.94	1,332,424.00	348.62	0.96
78	1,560,000	50	1,630,540.00	304,199.94	1,326,340.00	340.09	0.93
78	1,570,000	50	1,630,540.00	304,199.94	1,326,340.00	340.09	0.93
79	1,570,000	49	1,643,770.00	301,937.94	1,341,832.00	346.64	0.95
79	1,580,000	50	1,643,770.00	308,099.94	1,335,670.00	338.14	0.93
79	1,590,000	50	1,643,770.00	308,099.94	1,335,670.00	338.14	0.93
80	1,590,000	49	1,657,000.00	305,759.94	1,351,240.00	344.70	0.94
80	1,600,000	50	1,657,000.00	311,999.94	1,345,000.00	336.25	0.92

APPENDIX E - PROBATION COST MODEL EXCLUDING FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT COST - Continued

Officers	Population	Case Load	Expenditures	Income	Net Cost	Cost per Man/Year	Cost per Man/Day
80	1,610,000	50	1,647,000.00	311,999.94	1,345,000.00	336.25	0.92
81	1,610,000	49	1,676,280.00	309,581.94	1,366,698.00	344.34	0.94
81	1,620,000	50	1,676,280.00	315,899.94	1,360,380.00	335.90	0.92
81	1,630,000	50	1,676,380.00	315,899.94	1,360,380.00	335.90	0.92
82	1,630,000	49	1,689,510.00	313,403.94	1,376,106.00	342.49	0.94
82	1,640,000	50	1,689,510.00	319,799.94	1,369,710.00	334.08	0.92
82	1,650,000	50	1,689,510.00	319,799.94	1,369,710.00	334.08	0.92
83	1,650,000	49	1,702,740.00	317,225.94	1,385,514.00	340.67	0.93
83	1,660,000	50	1,702,740.00	323,699.94	1,379,040.00	332.30	0.91
83	1,670,000	50	1,702,740.00	323,699.94	1,379,040.00	332.30	0.91
84	1,670,000	49	1,769,320.00	321,047.94	1,448,272.00	351.86	0.96
84	1,680,000	50	1,769,320.00	327,599.94	1,441,720.00	343.27	0.94
84	1,690,000	50	1,769,320.00	327,599.94	1,441,720.00	343.27	0.94
85	1,690,000	50	1,782,550.00	324,869.94	1,457,680.00	349.98	0.96
85	1,700,000	50	1,782,550.00	331,499.94	1,451,050.00	341.42	0.94
85	1,710,000	50	1,782,550.00	331,499.94	1,451,050.00	341.42	0.94

VITA

Robert Lee Frazier was born on December 19, 1936 in Houston, Texas, the third of three children born to Everett E. and Mable I. Frazier. He attended public schools in Ohio and Texas and graduated from High School at College Station, Texas in 1955.

Robert Lee Frazier graduated from Sam Houston State University in 1959 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mathematics with a minor in Sociology. Honors and Societies in College included membership in Phi Mu Alpha, Alpha Kappa Delta and Scabbard and Blade. Upon his graduation from Sam Houston, he was designated a Distinguished Military Graduate and offered a Regular Army Commission as an Ordnance Officer. His tours of duty in the United States Army included assignments in Texas, Alabama, Louisiana, Virginia, Oklahoma, Germany and Viet Nam. His major professional experience has been six years in Command and three years in Management Systems Analysis in the United States Army, three years in project scheduling supervision in the aircraft industry and one year as a Correctional Officer with the Texas Department of Corrections.

Virgie and Robert Frazier have three girls age eight, ten and twelve. They make their home in Huntsville, Texas.